The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME VI APRIL, 1920 NUMBER 1

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION[1]

When the call went out in June, 1884, for a meeting to be held at Saratoga the following September, with the purpose of organizing into an American Historical Association teachers, specialists, writers and others interested in the advancement of historical study in this country, the outlook was by no means a favorable one.[2]

Although the project was strongly encouraged on all sides, particularly by the religious press of the country, the number of students capable of taking a serious share in the work of historical research then being promoted in the United States was indeed limited. There were at that time scarcely twenty professors and instructors in our leading educational institutions who were giving their entire time to the class in history. In most

[1] Address read at the Inaugural Session of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, Cleveland, Ohio, December 30, 1919. Some fifty Catholic scholars were present at the organization of this new national society. The object of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION is to promote study and research in the field of Catholic history. The Association is composed of three Conferences on Ancient Church History, Medieval Church History, and Modern Church History. Such a society makes it possible to bring into one body all the Catholic historical scholarship of the United States. The following officers were elected: *President*, Lawrence F. Flick, M.D., LL.D.; *Vice-Presidents*, Rev. Richard H. Tierney, S.J., and Rev. Victor O'Daniel, O.P., S.T.M.; *Secretary*, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Ph.D.; *Treasurer*, Rt. Rev. Monsignor T. C. O'Reilly, D.D., V.G.; *Archivist*, Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D. The Executive Council includes, with the above-named officers, Rev. Gilbert P. Jennings, LL.D. (Cleveland), Rt. Rev. Monsignor Joseph F. Mooney, D.D., V.G. (New York), Rev. Dr. Souvay, C.M. (St. Louis), Rev. William Busch, L.M.H.Sc. (St. Paul), and Rev. Zephyrin Engelhardt, O.F.M. (Santa Barbara, Calif.). The First Annual Meeting will take place December 27–30, 1920.

[2] *Papers* of the American Historical Association, Vol. i, No. 1, p. 5.

cases, history was merely an adjunct to some other science. Thirty-five years ago some of our leading universities and colleges were cautiously considering whether a professorship of history could or could not be established; and even so well known a scholar as President Eliot of Harvard warned a group of students at the time that to fit themselves for such a professorship would be the height of imprudence.[3]

Since then the situation has been completely changed.

To no other division of historical study was this change more welcome than to ecclesiastical history. The modern period had been ushered in with a systematic assault on the Church's past by the Centuriators of Magdeburg. Objective estimate of historical facts and impartiality of treatment were laid aside in the long sixteenth-century struggle for what may be termed religious self-determination. Only after three hundred years, and then under the influence of the romantic school of the early nineteenth century, did the historical world reach a better appreciation of medieval Catholicism. To many, besides Joseph de Maistre, historical criticism meant participation in that general conspiracy against the truth which was then apparently dominating the learned world. This new era in modern historiography with its more penetrating and more objective criticism of Church history brought about a series of vindications of the Catholic past of the world.

Catholic students of history recognize as one of the causes of this new era the opening of the Vatican Archives by Pope Leo XIII, in 1883. At that time, the great Pontiff could write without fear of bias that the method of treating history had been turned "into a means of throwing suspicion upon the Church." In the *Saepenumero considerantes* of August 18, 1883, Pope Leo dealt severely with the situation in his day: History had become a deadly poison; it had created a new species of warfare against the Christian faith; it had become subservient to the interests of parties and to the passions of men; it was imbuing the minds of the young with disgust for venerable antiquity and with an overweening contempt for most holy personages; it had strayed far from the path it had trod in olden times when it was the

[3] *The American Historical Association* (1884-1909), article by J. Franklin Jameson, Ph.D., in the *American Historical Review*, Vol. xv, (1909), pp. 1–13.

preceptor of life and the light of truth; it had become the approver of vice and the slave of corruption. In this same letter which opened the historical treasures of Rome to the world, the Pontiff laid down in the clearest terms the fundamental principle which should guide the Catholic method in historical study.

> No effort should be spared to refute inventions and falsehoods; and the writers must always bear this rule in mind: that the first law of history is, not to dare to utter falsehood; the second, not to fear to speak the truth; and, moreover, no room must be left for suspicion of partiality or prejudice.[4]

Students of history can well recognize in this noble utterance of Pope Leo one of the contributing causes to the renaissance of historical interest centering around the year 1884. In the changed, indeed sympathetic, attitude of scholarship in this country since that time towards the past history of the Church, foremost stands the influence of the American Historical Association.

The founders of the Association in that year were, without knowing it, at the beginning of a new and more fruitful era in the development of American historiography. The forty gentlemen who met at Saratoga on September 9, 1884, for the inaugural session of the Association began their conference with the problem of defining their relationship to existing historical organizations. The decision to form an independent society, and one open to all interested in historical study, was quickly reached. Doctor Jameson has described this meeting as follows:

> The simple constitution then framed, and adopted the next day, has with slight alterations served the Association to the present time. But its preparation brought up at once some of the gravest questions of the society's future, questions vividly debated in the committee. Should the effort be made to form something like an Academy of History, small in numbers, imposing in the weight of its individual members, and exerting through that weight a powerful influence on the development of the science; or should the society be a more popular body into which any respectable and educated person interested in history might be admitted? One who stood upon the losing side of the question has since described it as being "whether we should try to be as big as possible or as good as possible." This has a specious sound, but "good" in such matters

[4] Pope Leo's Letter to Cardinals di Luca, Pitra, and Hergenroether will be found in English in the *Ave Maria* (Notre Dame), Vol. xix (1883), pp. 741–761, and in Latin as an Appendix to STANG, *Historiographia Ecclesiastica*. Louvain, 1897.

> is good in relation to the existing conditions and the possibilities of achievement. Nothing has prevented any member from presenting to the Association as learned and profound a paper as he might have presented to a select forty having thirty-nine specialties different from his; and in any body, the older heads have their full share of influence. On the other hand, how largely has the American public, scientific or other, shown itself disposed to defer to the authority, in any time, of forty Immortals—immortals voiceless for lack of endowment, and unable to obtain governmental support unless with governmental selection? Diffusion of influence, diffused participation, is the democratic mode. The older element is quickened and helped by the presence of the younger; the wiser, even, by the presence of those whom in American life they must perforce address. It would be hard to persuade anyone who has attended a meeting of the American Historical Association and carefully watched what goes on, in and out of the formal sessions, that a gathering from which nine-tenths of the present attendants were absent would do as much good for the common cause.[5]

The story of the Association's success during the past thirty-five years is too well known to need review in this paper. It has been justly claimed that no historical society in the world has been more extensively useful to its countrymen. None who participated in the work of organizing the Association that pleasant September day in 1884 ever regretted his share in its foundation.

We are honored this morning by the presence of one who was present in Saratoga as a Founder of the Association. Doctor Jameson may not be known personally to the majority of those present at this meeting, but those of us who have enjoyed his friendship have learned to esteem him as a sincere admirer of the historic past of our Church, as one whose life has been given generously and uncomplainingly to the steady advance of historical study in this country and abroad. We are fortunate in having him among us this morning, thirty-five years afterwards, at the inaugural session of this new national Catholic Historical Association, and I rejoice to have the opportunity at this auspicious moment to pay to him a tribute of high regard and appreciation for all he has done during the past generation in making Catholic history better understood.

The twofold purpose of the American Historical Association, namely, to advance the interests of American history and of

[5] As in note 3.

general history in America has never been lost sight of from the beginning. There is this difference among Catholic students of history: many societies for the study of American Catholic history have been founded; but in the field of general Church history there has never been any attempt at national organization on the part of American Catholics, while in that of the church history of America, Catholic scholarship in the United States has had a better representation since 1884 than any other religious body.

The year 1884 will, therefore, be perpetually memorable in American Catholic history.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore held in November-December, 1884, saw the high-water mark of this national interest in our Catholic past. For the first time since the beginning of her phenomenal growth after the Civil War, the Church acted and thought as a national body; and in the Pastoral Letter to the Faithful at the close of the Council we find this striking Charge:

> Train your children to a love of history and biography. Inspire them with the ambition to become so well acquainted with the history and doctrines of the Church as to be able to give an intelligent answer to any honest inquiry. . . . Teach your children to take a special interest in the history of our own country. We consider the establishment of our country's independence, the shaping of its liberties and laws as a work of special Providence, its framers 'building wiser than they knew', the Almighty's hand guiding them. . . . As we desire therefore that the history of the United States should be carefully taught in all our Catholic schools, and have directed that it be specially dwelt upon in the education of the young ecclesiastical students in our preparatory seminaries; so also we desire that it form a favorite part of the home library and home reading. We must keep firm and solid the liberties of our country by keeping fresh the noble memories of the past, and thus sending forth from our Catholic homes into the arena of public life not partisans but patriots.[6]

The whole country was awake in 1884 for the first time to the patriotic impulses which vivified our past history. At the first preliminary meeting in 1884 of those who are today the founders of our splendidly equipped American Historical Association, Justin Winsor said:

[6] To be found in the *Memorial Volume* of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (*ad finem*). Baltimore, 1885.

> We have come, gentlemen, to organize a new society, and fill a new field. Existing historical societies are local, by State and division of States, and give themselves only to the history of our own country. The only one not plainly by its title local, the American Antiquarian Society, is nevertheless very largely confined in its researches to New England subjects, though it sometimes stretches its ken to Central America and the Northwest. But our proposed name, though American by title, is not intended to confine our observation to this continent. We are to be simply American students devoting ourselves to historical subjects, without limitation in time or place. So no one can regard us as a rival of any other historical association in this country. We are drawn together because we believe there is a new spirit of research abroad—a spirit which emulates the laboratory work of the naturalists, using that word in its broadest sense. This spirit requires for its sustenance mutual recognition and suggestion among its devotees. We can deduce encouragement and experience stimulation by this sort of personal contact. Scholars and students can no longer afford to live isolated. They must come together to derive that zest which arises from personal acquaintance, to submit idiosyncrasies to the contact of their fellows, and they will come from the convocation healthier and more circumspect. The future of this new work is in the young men of the historical instinct—largely in the rising instructors of our colleges; and I am glad to see that they have not failed us in the present movement. . . . Those of us who are older are quickened by their presence.[7]

What Justin Winsor was to the country at large, John Gilmary Shea was to the Catholic Church of the United States. These two scholars had much in common, and some of Shea's most scholarly work was done for the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, which has justly given to Winsor a unique place in American historiography. Shea's fine, delicate enthusiasm can be seen beneath those words from the Pastoral which have just been quoted, for he was called to Baltimore during the Council to confer with the prelates on his *History of the Church in the United States*. No man felt the new spirit abroad more keenly than he. On August 3, 1884, he wrote to Monsignor Lambing:

> I never knew a greater interest to be felt or shown in the history of *Notre Mère la Sainte Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine* in this part of the world. This is extremely gratifying to me, and I trust we can encourage and maintain this feeling.

Both Winsor and Shea had vision—to use a commonplace of today. Winsor was chairman of the preliminary meetings which

[7] *Papers* of the AHA, *l. c.*, p. 11.

brought the American Historical Association into existence; Shea presided over the first meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York. Both gentlemen declined the presidency of the Society they helped to bring to life, for both were working at the time on volumes which have since made them known to the scholars of two continents. The work they began has flourished with vigor down to our own day. There are at the present time in the United States and Canada over five hundred organizations bearing the name of historical society. Secretary Leland of the American Historical Association has described this growth as follows:

> The American Nation more perhaps than any other is curious as to its history. Possibly this is because the American regards the history of his country, or at any rate of his State or locality, as a personal matter. Much of it has been made within the period covered by his own memory; he himself or his ancestors have had a part in making it; the beginnings of America are not so remote as to defy the imagination. At any rate, whatever the explanation, there are more historical societies in the United States than in any other country. They are devoted for the most part to the history of various territorial areas, but there are some that occupy themselves with other fields. Of such probably none have greater possibilities of usefulness than those which are concerned mainly with church or religious history. There are not many of these—the American Baptist Historical Society of Philadelphia, the New England Baptist Historical Society of Boston, the Presbyterian Historical Society of Philadelphia, and the Unitarian and Universalist Historical Societies, both naturally of Massachusetts, are the only societies devoted to the history of the non-Catholic denominations that find mention in a report made some years ago to the American Historical Association.[8]

In the field of religious history a better representation is seen in the number of Catholic historical societies founded since that date and in the fine quality of the studies published by these organizations. Our oldest Catholic Historical Society is the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA, founded in July, 1884.[9] Letters were sent out on July 4, 1884, and the first meeting of its founders was held on July 22 of that year. The minutes of that meeting are very instructive. The

[8] *Concerning Catholic Historical Societies*, article by Waldo G. Leland, in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. ii, p. 389.

[9] *The American Catholic Historical Society*, article by Rev. William Lallou, in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. i, pp. 193–195.

reasons for the Society were quite plainly described: the early history of the Church in the United States was comparatively unknown; valuable records and traditions were being lost for want of a corporate body to gather them together; interest in church history in general was very weak. "The object of this Society," we read in its Charter, "shall be the preservation and publication of Catholic American historical documents, the investigation of Catholic American history, especially that of Philadelphia."[10] The success of this undertaking is seen in the quarterly publication, the *Records*, which is now in its thirtieth volume.

The second of these Societies—the UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, founded in New York on December 9, 1884, owes its existence mainly to John Gilmary Shea.[11] The Third Plenary Council closed on December 7, 1884, and two days later, a number of gentlemen interested in history, at the invitation of Doctor Shea and Doctor Richard H. Clarke, met at the Catholic Protectory in New York to organize the United States Catholic Historical Society.

The success of these two pioneer Societies has been equal to that of any similar organization in the United States. Both were regarded from the outset by non-Catholic students as national Catholic historical societies devoted to American Church history.

The third Catholic Historical Society is the now defunct OHIO VALLEY CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, organized by Monsignor Lambing, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., February 1, 1885. This Society met once or twice and then disbanded.[12] Monsignor Lambing, the President, began in July, 1884, as a private venture, the quarterly publication of the *Historical Researches of Western Pennsylvania, principally Catholic*, which was changed in the course of a year to the *Catholic Historical Researches*. After two years of effort to make it a success, Martin I. J. Griffin, the grand old man of American Catholic historical circles in

[10] ACHS *Records*, Vol. i, pp. 1–14.

[11] *The United States Catholic Historical Society*, article by Charles G. Herbermann, LL.D., in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. ii, pp. 302–307.

[12] *The Story of a Failure: The Ohio Valley Catholic Historical Society*, in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. i, pp. 435-439.

Philadelphia, purchased the *Researches* in December, 1886, and published them until his death in November, 1911, as the *American Catholic Historical Researches*. Later they were merged into the quarterly *Records* of the same Society.

Of the societies founded since 1884, there were: the BROOKLYN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, and the NEW ENGLAND CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, established in 1901, both of which have apparently ceased to function; the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ST. PAUL, founded in 1905, the *Acta et Dicta* of which are becoming more valuable with each number; the MAINE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY founded by the scholarly Doctor Walsh, Bishop of Portland, in 1913, which publishes the *Maine Catholic Historical Magazine*, now in its eighth volume; the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ST. LOUIS, founded by a group of Catholic scholars of that city in 1917, which publishes the *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review*; and the ILLINOIS CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY, founded at Chicago, in February, 1918, which issues a scholarly quarterly—the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*. "During the past five years," to use Mr. Leland's words, "there has appeared from the Catholic University of America, the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, which has received most favorable notice from the historical profession in general and which promises to become the recognized organ of all American Catholic historical activity."[13]

To start an entirely new organization in this field requires very serious reasons. In describing the formation of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis, Father Rothensteiner says:

> In an age of innumerable societies, associations and unions, for every conceivable purpose, it may seem supererogatory and utterly hopeless to come forward with our Society. . . . A society for the suppression of all societies would appear to many weary souls as of greater importance. Yet it must always be borne in mind that, besides the bad and indifferent organizations, there are also many of high character and distinct usefulness. The living principle of every kind of activity being one with its purpose, it follows that the higher the purpose of an institution, the more highly must we value the institution itself, provided its proposed end could not be better attained in other ways.[14]

These words may well be taken as the keynote of all that

[13] As in note 7.

[14] *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. i, p. 8.

follows. Creative agencies of a broader and deeper interest in the history of the Church cannot be confined to Catholic historical groups such as those mentioned above. The combined action of the best scholars of the American Historical Association is just beginning, after twenty years' effort, to save the public schools and the non-sectarian colleges from their present state of mal-organization in the historical sciences. One has but to study the conclusions of the different committees of the American Historical Association to realize that the great change which has come into the teaching of political history could never have occurred, were it not for the Reports of the Committee of Seven and the Committee of Eight which form the basis of the present curriculum of history in most of the schools in this country.

The Catholic school system needs a similar guidance, and the work to be done is too vast for any one scholar or for any one local group of historical scholars. The voice that speaks must represent the whole country and the best historical talent in the land.

Historical scholars of today, with but few exceptions, and those negligible ones, recognize with sympathy the part the Church has had in the civilization of the world. But they cannot be expected to devote themselves exclusively to that historical Catholic past. The spirit of the American Historical Association has never been a provincial one, but the incorporation of the Association by the Government in January 1889, created a dependence on the Smithsonian Institution which has affected the publishing of articles on religious history. In regard to this censorship, I quote from Doctor Jameson's illuminating article on the American Historical Association:

> The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is likely, in the exercise of this somewhat anomalous function, to confine himself to the exclusion, from a report presented to Congress, of matter such as is usually excluded from other reports offered to that body. This, however, effects two serious limitations, the one based on political, the other on religious, grounds. In the first place, it is not probable, for instance, that the Association could print in a governmental volume such an article as that which Professor Hart contributed to the third volume of the old papers, *The Biography of a River and Harbor Bill*, a most plain-spoken analysis of recent Congressional proceedings. In the second place, Congress has a peculiar traditional feeling with regard to the printing of

religious matter. The religion of the Hopi or the Igorrote is deemed a legitimate subject for historical discussion in a scientific publication of the government. Not so the Christian religion. While excellent reasons for restraint in the treatment of its history, in volumes paid for by public taxation, must occur to every right-thinking mind, instances of unreasonable objection on the part of individual members, or of unreasonable clamor on the part of portions of the public have pushed Congress into strange extremes of caution. An impartial essay on the Spiritual Franciscans of the thirteenth century or the Interdict as practised in the twelfth would seem to be a perfectly non-explosive compound; but the authorities of the Smithsonian Institution, interpreting the mind of Congress as by long experience they have found it, have ruled that such discussions fall outside the lines of the Annual Reports. The limitation thus effected is a grave one, especially in the history of the Middle Ages, for medieval history with the Church omitted would almost be *Hamlet* with Hamlet left out.[15]

There is but one Society in the United States devoted to ecclesiastical history in its broadest sense—the American Society of Church History. Founded in 1888, by Philip Schaff, it held annual meetings in New York and published a volume of papers each year until 1896 when it was merged into the American Historical Association, becoming the Church History Section. It was soon evident that the merger was not an acceptable one to all concerned; in 1906, the Society was reorganized as an independent organization. There are some Catholics in its membership, and a few papers by Catholic students have been printed during the past thirty-one years.

A distinctly Catholic organization with the definite object of promoting interest in Catholic history both in this and other lands, of this and other ages, seems necessary, if the Church is to be recognized in her true position as the sacred and perpetual mother of all that is best and holiest in modern civilization.

An American Catholic Historical Association would arouse among Catholics in this roseate land of opportunity an instinct of love and veneration for the religious history of the world. This ideal any scholar or any group of scholars might well consider fitting for the work of a lifetime; for the one ultimate end of such an organization, tne one doctrine upon which it is built, the only one upon which it may rest in all surety of purpose, is to promote among those who rejoice in the name of Catholic a more

[15] As in note 3.

intimate knowledge of the history of the Kingdom of God on earth.

This, then, is the project which I have the honor of placing before you this morning. It is a project commensurate with the historical scholarship existent in the Church of our beloved country. Ambitious in its design, it is essentially necessary in its concept, if the glorious annals of our Faith are to be made known in all their beauty to Catholic and non-Catholic alike. For twenty centuries the Church has never faltered in its marvelous work of civilization. Across the ages its doctrine has shown the road to salvation; its apostolate has guided mankind into ways of righteousness; its institutions have ever been rallying the hosts of God against the powers of evil; its struggles and triumphs have attracted to its side men and women of every creed and race; and its salutary influence upon life, upon letters, arts, sciences, and culture has never slackened since the day when Pentecost's fire set ablaze the hearts of men with the highest idealism the world has seen.

REV. PETER GUILDAY, Ph.D.,
Washington, D. C.

FATHERS BADIN AND NERINCKX AND THE DOMINICANS IN KENTUCKY

A LONG MISUNDERSTOOD EPISODE IN AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY[1]

It is not without considerable regret that we undertake to give the readers of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW an historical account of the early Dominicans of Kentucky in their well-known misunderstanding with Revs. Stephen T. Badin and Charles Nerinckx, two of the most noted pioneer missionaries of that state. Of itself, the episode would deserve no more than a casual reference in a history of those friars; but, unfortunately, Father Nerinckx's first biographer has badly prejudiced the whole story.

Nor is this all. Following the one-sided presentation of the case found in the letters of Fathers Badin and Nerinckx, that author not merely gives his readers to understand that the blame for the trouble which those two zealous priests experienced in Kentucky, is largely to be laid at the door of Father Edward D. Fenwick, later the first Bishop of Cincinnati, and his companions in religion; he even insinuates that the charges of officiousness, of want of zeal and of laxity, both religious and ministerial, may justly be imputed to these early Dominicans.[2] For forty years

[1] The sources used for this article, besides those directly referred to in the text and notes, are principally: Archives of Saint Joseph's Province of Dominicans; Saint Rose's Priory, Springfield, Kentucky; Saint Joseph's Priory, Somerset, Ohio; Archives of the Dominican Master General, Rome; the Dominican Fathers, London, England, and the Baltimore Archdiocesan Archives. Among the books consulted are WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky;* VOLZ, *A Century's Record;* DECOURCY-SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States;* SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* Vols. ii and iii; *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vols. ii, iii, iv, v, xi.

[2] MAES, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx*, pp. 160-184. Father Maes, when writing of this unpleasantness, is singularly unfair to these early Dominicans. Parts of Father Nerinckx's letters that are essential to show his extravagance and inner spirit, are left out of the translations. In some places, words and even phrases are omitted or added (still they are in quotation marks), without any indication of such tampering; or are so changed as materially to affect the sense of the originals, to make them the more plausible, and to render them the more telling against the missionary's imaginary enemies. Designedly do we call them imaginary, for a careful perusal of the documents in the case shows them to have been largely such. In some instances Father Maes makes the documents practically his own. See originals in DOCUMENTS, pp. 66–88.

this unfair and injurious representation of the friars has gone its rounds, receiving all too wide a credence and tarnishing the fair names of men who have deserved well of the American Church. For this reason, now that the Diocese of Cincinnati is about to celebrate its centenary, we feel constrained to give the public the present article in justification of Ohio's first ordinary. Yet, after all, it is perhaps no more than a belated contribution to our ecclesiastical literature demanded in the interest of historic truth and fair-mindedness.

Rev. Edward D. Fenwick, O.P., was born in Maryland, but was sent in his youth to the college of the English Dominicans, Bornheim, Belgium. On the completion of his classical course the young American entered the Order to which his preceptors belonged. This was in 1788. One of his prime purposes in this step was to establish the religious institute which he had learned to love, in his native Maryland, that it might aid in the diffusion of the Catholic religion through the United States. Basing his plan on that of the English fathers at Bornheim, the young American conceived the idea of devoting his part of the paternal estate to founding a house of the Order of Saint Dominic in the former palatinate of Lord Baltimore. This was to be the beginning of his work, a center whence missionaries might go forth in all directions to carry the light of the Gospel to his fellow-countrymen. Connected with the house he would have a college for the education of youth. This, he felt, would aid in supplying the pious enterprise with vocations and means of support.[3]

Fifteen years, however, passed before the young divine found the circumstances propitious for beginning his long-cherished design. In the meantime, the French Revolution had thrown a gloom over, if not paralyzed, the religious institutes in France and Belgium. This, together with the anti-Order prejudices in England, but especially the fact that all religious in the countries under French domination were made subject to the diocesan

[3] Rev. E. D. Fenwick, Carshalton, England, to Rev. R. L. Concanen, Rome, March 15, 1803, January 3, April 14, August 29, and (London) September 1, 1804 (Archives of the Dominican Master General, Codex xiii, 731); Fenwick, Carshalton, to Bishop Carroll, January 12 and May 5, 1804 (Baltimore Archives, Case 3, R 1 and 2); Concanen to Fenwick, November 19, 1803 (Archives of the Dominican Fathers, London); PALMER, Anglia Dominicana (MSS.), Part III, p. 722 (*ibid.*) and *Obituary Notices of the Friar-Preachers of the English Province*, p. 26.

ordinaries, turned the minds of some of Father Fenwick's English confrères towards his American project, which had been warmly espoused by the authorities at Rome and heartily welcomed by Bishop Carroll. These were Revs. Samuel T. Wilson, Robert A. Angier and William R. Tuite, men of much learning and high standing, as well as of great piety.[4]

Fathers Fenwick and Angier, the first to come to America, arrived in November, 1804, and were cordially received by the father of the American hierarchy. Fenwick's design had been to make his foundation in his native Maryland. Great, therefore, was his disappointment when he learned that Bishop Carroll had promised them to Kentucky. This had been done largely in response to the distressed and heartfelt appeals for priests from the Catholics of that state and its lone missionary, Rev. Stephen T. Badin.[5] Father Fenwick, however, was too good and zealous an ambassador of Christ, as well as too thoroughly trained a religious, to hesitate to go wherever the voice of authority or the salvation of souls called him. Accordingly, in the spring of 1805, at the request of Doctor Carroll, he journeyed on to the west to learn what prospects were held out by that country for his proposed institution. On his arrival in Kentucky, he was received with open arms by both the people and Father Badin. Indeed, this veteran missionary was so pleased with Fenwick that he offered to turn over his own and the church lands in the state to the friars, and begged to be received into the Order of Saint Dominic. On May 15, 1805, he wrote to Bishop Carroll earnestly urging him to give his consent to both these proposals.[6]

---

[4] Fenwick's letters as in note 3. Father Wilson, then on his way to Kentucky, writing to Father Concanen from Georgetown, October 14, 1805, says: "Ever since the notice I received from our Archbishop, Monsr. Rocquelaure, that all religious in France, being now secularized by His Holiness, were entirely under his jurisdiction, I have turned my thoughts to America, where a new prospect opens of labouring with success" (Archives of the Dominican Master General, Codex xiii, 731). How different this true reason for his coming to the United States from that excogitated by Maes (*op. cit.*, pp. 171-72). For Cardinal Caprara's decree secularizing all religious in France, see VERMEERSCH, *De Religiosis Institutis et Personis*, Vol. ii, p. 466.

[5] Several letters of Father Badin and the people of Kentucky in the Baltimore Archives show how they sought to obtain priests for that mission.

[6] Fenwick, Piscataway, Maryland, to Concanen, August 1, 1805 (Archives of the Dominican General, as above). Father Badin's letter referred to is in the Baltimore Archives, Case 1, G 9. See DOCUMENTS, p. 66.

Satisfied with the promises offered by that new state for the enterprise, Father Fenwick returned to Maryland to report to his ordinary and to Rome, to await further authorization from the Order's General and the coming of the other two recruits, and to make preparations for settling his little band of priests in the west. On August 1, 1805, he wrote to Rev. R. L. Concanen, one of the assistants to the Order's General, telling him of the good prospects for the pious undertaking in Kentucky, and of Father Badin's proposals. These latter, he says, Bishop Carroll "applauds and consents to."[7] The friar's heart was further gladdened by the arrival, early in September, of Fathers Wilson and Tuite. A month later, came letters from Rome empowering Doctor Carroll to proceed with the foundation of the new Dominican province. Fenwick was detained in Maryland by the settlement of his paternal estate until June or July, 1806. Angier, at the request of Bishop Carroll, was left there to continue his labors on the missions until his presence became indispensable in Kentucky, and did not join his brethren until the fall of 1807. But Wilson and Tuite started on their westward journey at once (October, 1805), reaching their destination in the last days of the year.

In the meantime, however, July 18, 1805, Rev. Charles Nerinckx, a Belgian priest, had arrived in Kentucky. That indefatigable missionary, as a later page will show, brought from his native land a strong prejudice against the English Dominicans of Bornheim which he had imbibed on mere hearsay. He knew none of them. In Kentucky, an intimate friendship soon arose between him and Father Badin. Nor was the new missioner slow to instil his bias into the mind of his friend. It was clearly under this influence that the French priest, October 5–12, 1805, just a few days before Fathers Wilson and Tuite started on their journey to Kentucky, wrote to Bishop Carroll a letter which is a perfect travesty of what he had written to the same prelate in the previous May. Meanwhile, it must be noted, he had seen no Dominican. Yet all is now changed. The French missionary has turned a complete somersault of both mind and heart. It would be not only unwise, but dangerous and uncanonical to

[7] See note 6.

confer upon the friars the woodlands belonging to the Church in Kentucky. The reasoning and canon law which he adduces for the change must have provoked the venerable prelate to a smile. Five months before, a religious Order was Kentucky's great need. Now an Order might be even a peril to its Church.[8]

Bishop Carroll, it would seem, was not at all pleased with Father Badin's censorious letter announcing his change of mind. At least, another letter from the same missionary, written more than six months afterwards, is proof positive that the venerable prelate never answered it, or even acknowledged its receipt.[9] Father Badin goes so far in this document (October 5–12, 1805), as to tell his ordinary that Father Nerinckx "does strongly suspect the purity of their [the Dominicans'] faith." This was in consequence of the preconceived prejudices of which we have spoken. Then we read: "He is so much disheartened at the thought of becoming partaker with them in the sacred ministry, that he spoke with resolution of his leaving the State, if the Dominicans trouble themselves otherwise than with a college." But it should be noted in this connection that, although Bishop Carroll did not even acknowledge the receipt of this letter, he took occasion of a later one from the same source to justify the friars, and to assure the other missionaries of their untainted faith and righteousness.[10]

Such was the bias which the Dominicans encountered in Kentucky. In view of it, one might expect almost any action or statement on the part of the two clergymen who had preceded them. Father Wilson tells us that, on his and Father Tuite's arrival, the people were publicly warned against them. Although Father Nerinckx had signified his intention of leaving the missions, should these friars undertake any ministerial labors, hardly have Wilson and Tuite set foot in the state when he begins to belittle their zeal and to accuse them of refusing to bear the

[8] This document has two parts. One is dated October 5, the other October 12, 1805. By an oversight, it has been indexed as two letters, and placed under G 10 and G 11, Case 1 of the Baltimore Archives. It is printed, but with a notable omission, in the *Records* of the *American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, xxiii, 166-174. See DOCUMENTS, pp. 68–73.

[9] Badin to Bishop Carroll, May 28, 1806 (Baltimore Archives, Case A Special, L 14).

[10] Badin to Carroll as in the preceding note.

heat and the burden of the day, of seeking an easy life, and of caring little for the salvation of souls. He declares that, according to their own words, none of them intend to toil on the missions, that their only object seems to be to extend their own Order, and that, therefore, their presence in Kentucky will be of scant benefit to the Church.[11]

But in view of the fact that it was Father Fenwick's positive intention that some of his confrères should labor on the missions, and that, as may be seen from all his letters, one of his prime objects in the establishment of the new province of Dominicans was to raise up missionaries for the country, it seems most improbable that any of the friars ever gave the Flemish clergyman the information he claims to have received from them. Fathers Wilson and Tuite, the first to arrive in Kentucky, were specially designed to teach in the college and novitiate which they proposed founding. This, if anything, must have been what they told Father Nerinckx; and their words were doubtless magnified into the sweeping assertions found in his letters. Nor must we forget that, even after the arrival of Bishop Flaget and the days of a more plentiful supply of priests, the Friars Preacher continued to devote themselves to apostolic labors to such an extent as greatly to interfere with the welfare of their college and convent. All this, together with their well-known fruitful zeal, their spirit of self-sacrifice, their privations for Christ's sake, evidenced by many documents that might be laid before the reader, proves beyond question how groundless and gratuitous are Father Nerinckx's declarations.

Not in a single line of his early letters—and they are many—does the zealous Belgian missionary (for truly zealous he was) speak a kind word of the friars. It is, therefore, passing strange to see the author of Father Nerinckx's first life, with the documents before him—he cites none to prove the statment—write: "Fathers Badin and Nerinckx had hailed their advent with genuine delight, and gave unsparing and oft-repeated praise to

[11]Father Wilson to Bishop Carroll, August 25, 1806 (Baltimore Archives, Case 8 B, L 6); Nerinckx to same, February 6, 1806 (*ibid.*, Case 8A, U2); Nerinckx to Joseph Peemans, Louvain (?), as quoted by Peemans in an account of the missions of Kentucky for the Propaganda (Propaganda Archives, America Centrale, Vol. iii, ff. 235-260); MAES, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-69.

these new co-laborers."[12] Withal, it is worthy of note, that if Fenwick's apostolic labors were placed on one scale-pan of a balance, and those of Nerinckx on the other, great and fruitful as these latter surely were, those versed in the ecclesiastical history of Kentucky and Ohio cannot doubt but that the beam would tip in the friar's favor.

Many things conspired with Father Nerinckx's preconceived prejudices to intensify his dislike for the fathers after their arrival in Kentucky. The Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J., in a letter to the Hon. Benj. Webb, observes: "Some one writes to me, speaking of Father Nerinckx and the Dominicans: 'Father Nerinckx, with all his humility, was too sensitive.'"[13] So he was. No sooner had the fathers arrived in Kentucky than the people, because of the undue rigor to which they were subjected by the other missionaries, flocked to them from far and wide for the reception of the Sacraments. This, as may be seen from his own letters, Father Nerinckx, pious as he was, could not bear with equanimity; nor can there be any doubt but that his pique added poignancy to his pen.[14]

So, too, as Father Hill further remarks, the good priest's notorious letter of June 30, 1808, shows that he was deeply offended by the loss of Saint Ann's Parish, the largest in the State, through the Dominicans. But this was no fault of theirs. Although he had been in charge of Saint Ann's hardly a year when it was placed under the permanent care of the friars by the vicar-general, Father Badin, possibly by Bishop Carroll himself, it was Father Nerinckx's favorite of all the missions. His chagrin, it may have been, was all the greater because he was

[12] MAES, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

[13] Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J., Saint Louis, to Hon. Benj. Webb, July 9, 1880 (Archives of Saint Joseph's Province).

[14] The way in which Maes (*op. cit.*, p. 172) attempts to explain the popularity of the Dominicans in Kentucky, reminds one strikingly of Prescott's elucidations of the Church's influence on the faithful. "Drawn [he says] by the novel ceremonial of the Dominican Order, and its picturesque dress, which, as experience teaches, are powerful attractions in the eyes of people unused to such interesting displays, the Catholics flocked to them from far and wide." Maes' un-Catholic bit of philosophy, however, falls quite flat, when it is recalled that the people began to "flock" to the friars when there were only two of them (Wilson and Tuite) in the State, and while these lived miles apart. Surely there was then little chance for "display" of "novel ceremonial," etc. The true explanation of the friars' popularity is the more orthodox and kindlier ministrations which the people received at their hands.

thus thwarted in the plan which he had conceived of erecting a brick church in this settlement.[15]

Father Badin was a Frenchman; Father Nerinckx a Belgian. Three of the Dominicans were British. The other was an American; but he was of English origin, and had spent the greater part of his life abroad with Englishmen. Nearly all the people in Kentucky were Americans, but of English descent. Now experience and history both teach us that different nationalities are often as so many misfitting cogs that prevent even the mill of Christ from running smoothly. This is why we have had friction in church circles through all the country, where foreigners have gathered in sufficient numbers to give play to national prejudices. Documents leave no room for doubt that such an influence had its part in the disagreement of which we speak.

Father Nerinckx's letters show that with his love of God he joined an intense attachment to his countrymen. This led to the desire of surrounding himself with clergymen from his native land, and caused him to conceive the plan of making at least a part of Kentucky a mission principally, if not entirely, in charge of Belgian priests.[16] One cannot in reason blame him for so laudable an aim. But when he suffered himself, as he certainly did, to be so incensed at the Dominicans whose presence was an obstacle to his purpose, as to decry them in all manner of ways, he cannot be freed from censure. This is all the more true because these friars had gone to Kentucky at the earnest solicitation of Bishop Carroll, who had promised them to that desolate part of his diocese before Father Nerinckx arrived in America.

Possibly the most insidious, crafty and disloyal heresy the Church has had to combat was that of Jansenism, so named from Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres. It taught that Christ died for only the elect, whose salvation alone He willed; and that nothing good done by the reprobate—it held positive reprobation—can avail them aught in the way of eternal life. One can

[15] Father Nerinckx to Bishop Carroll, June 30, 1808 (*Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 5).—The mission of Saint Ann, it seems certain, was attended by Father Wilson from early in 1806, though it appears to have remained under Father Nerinckx's jurisdiction until after Fenwick's arrival in the summer of the same year

[16] This is evident from many of Nerinckx's letters, from Peemans' account to the Propaganda, and from Maes' biography.

readily see to what excesses these teachings opened the door. In a word, Jansenism was Puritanic in spirit, and savored much of the arid and levelling doctrines of Calvinism. Like Gallicanism, it sought to restrain the Pope's authority over the Church in favor of the bishops and temporal rulers. The adherents of this sect looked to the accidentals of religion rather than to the essentials. In practice, they placed discipline—fasting, for instance, penance and mortification—before the life-giving Sacraments of Christ. Thus, again, Jansenism was a species of Christian Pharisaism. Jansenists overlooked the proper part of the heart and the feelings in worship, preached a discouraging rigorism which they adorned with the names of virtue and austerity, and denounced as laxists all who did not subscribe to their gloomy and austere views. Their principles, quite naturally, led to extreme severity in their moral doctrine and in the administration of the Sacraments.

Although the doctrines of Jansenism were condemned time and again, its followers long held their ground, without renouncing their errors. This they did through chicane and by pretense of following the practices of primitive Christianity, of remaining Catholics and of belonging to the Church, in spite of the Church. Their support of the absolutist theories of the times won them the favor of statesmen, while the cloak of austerity with which they colored their teachings, as is ever the case, appealed to many of the faithful with ascetic temperaments. In this way, even the leaven of true Catholic doctrine eventually became tainted with the poison. Confession and communion, the great channels of grace instituted by Christ for salvation, were administered with such severity as to cause them to be woefully neglected. There were, it is true, many holy persons who were imbued with the spirit of Jansenism. But their errors were through no fault of their own, for they imbibed them in spite of themselves. They were in good faith. Withal, had not the Church been divine, Jansenism would have dealt her a deathblow.

As Father Maes correctly states, it cannot be denied that the French and Belgian clergy of the eighteenth century "were considerably tainted by the Jansenistic teachings;" and that the "bitter fruits" of this may still be seen in the neglect of the Sac-

raments by the people and the severity of the priests in the sacred tribunal. Through no fault of theirs, Fathers Badin and Nerinckx had heard this doctrine preached from the pulpit, had found it in their books, had been taught it in the seminary. The Belgian clergyman had practiced it in his ministerial duties at home for twenty years before coming to the New World.[17]

These Puritanic principles and exaggerated notions of severe morality they brought to America. In Kentucky their zeal led them to practice the same severity of discipline, and the same rigorism both in preaching and in the administration of the sacraments to which they had been accustomed abroad, but which were not suited to the Anglo-Saxon portion of the New World. The older Catholics of Kentucky had not been used to such extremes in Maryland; and the younger did not always take kindly to them. For this reason, even before the arrival of Father Nerinckx, the French missioner was rather disliked than loved. Many, as may be seen, not only from the letters of the Dominicans to Bishop Carroll, but from those of the other two priests, seldom approached the Sacraments; some never. When Father Nerinckx, stern and unbending by nature, came to the State, his influence seems to have induced his companion to become more rigorous and severe than ever.

Father Nerinckx possessed a calm demeanor, had a quiet even way, and was of serious bearing. This, together with his zeal, piety and personal austerity, made his ministrations more acceptable to the faithful than were those of Father Badin. By many, especially those of an ascetic temperament, the former was loved and admired as a spiritual guide. The latter, as is admitted, was vivacious and changeable, and given to harsh, cutting language. He had not a judicial temperament. Often he was imprudent. Withal, he was not less zealous than his friend. It would seem that his desire to emulate the Belgian missionary increased his stringency and brought about that discontent which, when it was rumored that he would likely be chosen for the proposed diocese of Kentucky, led to many complaints against him to Bishop Carroll. But before this, Father Nerinckx had begun to write bitter things against the Dominicans to the same prelate. Father Badin soon followed suit. How-

[17] MAES, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-170.

ever, as the documents in the archives of Baltimore are both numerous and long, we can do no more here than select four, two from each missioner, which suffice to give a fair idea of their correspondence in this matter.[18]

Indeed, Father Nerinckx's letters of June 2, 1806, and June 30, 1808, are so harsh, so reproachful alike of the Dominicans and the people, and so full of invective that, unless we knew otherwise from his contemporaries, they would convict him of no little conceit and shatter one's belief in his humility, piety, charity and spirit of mortification. As it is, they prove that his judgment was often at fault, that he was sensitive in the extreme, and that he gave too ready an ear to idle gossip. His determination to gain his point led him to employ language that was not only harsh and extravagant, but even violent. If the missionary's letters are any index to his dealings with the faithful, his ministrations could not have been otherwise than very distasteful to the greater number. In short, an ultra rigorist spirit shines out on every page. To those who have seen the original documents, and are acquainted with traditions still living in Kentucky, there can be no doubt as to the correctness of the statements which Father Wilson, writing on a pastoral matter, makes to Bishop Carroll:

> No place in the world, dear Sir [he says], is more in want of a prudent Bishop than Kentucky, where thousands are living in constant neglect of the Sacraments, through the too great zeal, I fear, of the former missioners. Young people are not admitted to them without a solemn promise of not dancing *on any occasion whatever*, which few will promise, and fewer still can keep. All priests that allow of dancing are publicly condemned to hell. . . . People taught that every kiss lip to lip between married persons is a mortal sin. . . . Women refused absolution for their husbands permitting a decent dance in their house—not to mention a thousand things far more ridiculously severe.[19]

Owing to their length, we can only touch on the more salient points of the two letters of Father Nerinckx selected for discussion. In that of June 2, 1806, he says that Father Badin must now admit that he has seen the realization of his (Nerinckx's) prophecy in regard to the Dominicans. They differ much from

[18] The letters of Father Badin and Nerinckx to Bishop Carroll that touch on this topic would make a portly volume. They run from 1805 to 1810 and are found in various cases of the diocesan archives of Baltimore.

[19] The date of this letter is August 25, 1806 (Baltimore Archives, as in note 5).

Badin in speculative theology, and wholly in some points of practice. Father Nerinckx knows not how much it is expedient to say, yet he can positively assert that: "Perhaps they will multiply the nation; but they will neither increase the joy nor renew the face of the earth." The wanton grow more insolent. Those who had been held in check by fear, if not by love, now that the lines are loosened, rush forth with stiffened necks, boasting that they have discovered the city of refuge. The other friars (Fenwick and Angier) "are expected to bring plenary indulgences that will not only remit penalties due to sin already forgiven, but prevent the incurring of guilt at all."[20]

Father Tuite, he says, though less learned than his colleague, appears to be more given to discipline. The other (Father Wilson) appears to be a man of great learning; but his learning "has led him, not to madness, but to a laxity which, for want of the flavor of salt, may perhaps be called infatuation." "Father Badin terms him a laxist; the people call him easy. Whether he should be placed among the extreme laxists I do not wish to be the judge. I am considered a rigorist; Father Badin both more rigorous and harsher." Father Nerinckx, however, seemed quite unable to realize that his practice was at all harsh or stinging.

Before his arrival in Kentucky, the missionary proceeds to say, Father Badin's discipline in regard to matrimony had been the occasion of much complaint and murmuring. But since Father Wilson's coming, he declares, everything in this matter is decided as if it concerned mere brutes, and without any regard whatever to the sacramental character and sanctity of the married state.[21]

Father Nerinckx does not believe that the Dominicans will succeed in founding a convent in Kentucky, as they are not willing to commence in a humble way; and he foresees that they will obtain but little financial aid from the people. Besides, he adds, "they are lovers of themselves, and are unduly terrified

[20] Nerinckx to Carroll, June 2, 1806 (Baltimore Archives, Case 8 A, U 1).

[21] Here Father Nerinckx writes at considerable length, and in a manner that must be pronounced shocking. One of his expressions is: "Ab illius R [everendi] P [atris] adventu res matrimonialis. . . . omnino pro votis equorum ac mulorum in parte carnali decisa est." Maes (*op. cit.*, p. 175) is guilty of considerable juggling in his rendition of this part of the missioner's letter. See DOCUMENTS, p. 80.

at the burden of the day and the heats." Should they, however, succeed in making a foundation, it is his earnest wish that some man imbued with the spirit of religious observance, and quickened with a zeal for souls, should be sent from another house of the Order, and placed in charge. For what real good, he continues, or what glory to religion, can be expected, if such men, far removed from a superior who can act as censor to their lives and as guardian of religious discipline, are placed over the people to form them to their own rule of life? "Be it far from me [he adds, however] to say that they are bad; but I do think that they are animated with too little zeal for religious observance."

This is certainly a severe arraignment. Its only palliation is that Father Nerinckx had been made purblind by the influences of which we have spoken. Apart from every other reason, the very lives of these early Dominicans prove these extravagant statements and veiled accusations too absurd to be believed by even the most credulous. These early fathers had as many, if not more, hardships and privations to bear than the Flemish missionary; they bore them with greater humility and patience. Father Nerinckx asserts more than once that he writes as he does out of his love of God and zeal for souls. One almost wonders if this can be true—if his bitter words were not largely inspired by umbrage and disappointment at the loss of his favorite parish and at seeing the prospect of his proposed Belgian mission dwindle. Be that as it may, history, we think, must pronounce the fathers' zeal and love of God equal to his. Certainly the historian knows that Dominican theology is rather severe than lax. It was for this reason that Father Concanen, when he heard of this accusation, took occasion to observe in writing to Archbishop Carroll:

> I wish to be remembered to Father Fenwick and his companions at Kentucky. I am surprised at the controversy arisen between them and Rev. Mr. Badin. It is the first time I ever heard of the Dominicans being accused of lax doctrine. It must be that that worthy and zealous man, Mr. Badin, has poisoned his mind by reading Jansenistical authors; for surely the sweet and lenient spirit of the Church abhors equally the extremes of laxity and rigour.[22]

Under the circumstances, it was fortunate for the early Church

[22] This letter is dated Rome, August 9, 1809, and is in Case 2, W7 of the Baltimore Archives.

of Kentucky that these friars had much of the tenderness of heart and kindly disposition characteristic of Saint Thomas of Aquin and Francis de Sales. Of Father Wilson, against whom these complaints were principally made, and whom Bishop Flaget called the shining light of his diocese, Bishop M. J. Spalding writes:

> Of refined and highly polished manners, as well as amiable, modest and learned, he was universally admired and beloved. He was of retiring habits, and much devoted to prayer and study. He was one of the most learned divines who ever emigrated to America. . . . He died, in the same odour of sanctity in which he had lived, in the summer of 1824. Long and reverently will the Catholics of Kentucky remember his virtues, which are freshly embalmed in the recollection of his brethren. He was a bright ornament of an illustrious Order, and its early history in the United States is identified with his biography.[23]

Indeed, that distinguished theologian and scholar might have felt complimented at being considered in the same light that Saint Paul was considered by the pagan Festus, mad because of his learning. "Paul [said Festus], thou art beside thyself: much learning doth make thee mad. And Paul said: I am not mad, most excellent Festus, but I speak words of truth and soberness" (Acts, xxvi, 24-25). The letters of all these early friars show them to have been gentlemen, as well as possessed of truly priestly characters and scholarly attainments. In regard to their spirit of religious discipline and observance, of which the Belgian clergyman could have known nothing—for he refused to associate with them—no more need be said than that one marvels why he was so critical when it is remembered that only two of them were then in Kentucky, and that they lived some twenty miles apart. Wilson was at Saint Ann's; Tuite near Bardstown. It is still more strange to find Father Nerinckx's biographer claiming that he had "formed a correct idea of the state of affairs at St. Rose's," when St. Rose's did not exist, and proving his contention by Bishop Spalding who states precisely the reverse of what Maes cites him to establish.[24]

[23] SPALDING, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky*, pp. 154-155.

[24] MAES, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-76 (note). This author here declares that Father Nerinckx gives "a correct idea of the state of affairs at St. Rose's." But, mark! This letter was written, June 2, 1806. Fenwick was still in Maryland. He purchased the farm on which Saint Rose's Convent stands, in July, 1806, and took possession of it the following December. To prove his contention Nerinckx's biographer quotes a passage from Spalding's *Life of Bishop Flaget*, page 288. Spalding, however, says

A living, nay, an inspiriting tradition in the province of Dominicans which they established tells us that those early fathers were scrupulously exact in the duties of their state of life; and that they sought, even under the most adverse circumstances, to carry out the rules and constitutions of their Order. Owing to the fact that they wrote but seldom, and to the destructive agencies of time, we have few documents bearing directly on this subject. Fortunately, however, we have enough distinctly to establish the truth of this tradition. In 1816, for instance, the Master General writes to congratulate the little band of religious on their spirit of observance. Then, an extract, in Italian, from a letter of the Provincial to Rev. John A. Hill, gives us a very pretty and illuminating account of their life, their studies and their labors on the missions. It informs us that their religious discipline and observance were all that could be desired. Community life, after the convent of Saint Rose had been established, was rigidly kept up in accordance with the rule. The choral office and the devotions of the institute were observed most religiously. The community frequently rose at midnight—never later than four in the morning. Community life was perfect. The beds were of hard straw. Even the canonical tonsure was worn by those not out on the missions; although, for prudence' sake, this practice was afterwards discontinued. Considering the trying labors and the circumstances of time and place, the Order's regulations for abstinence were perhaps followed too rigidly for the health of the community. The country was new and unsettled; eggs and butter, even vegetables, were scarce; fish almost an unknown luxury, cheese entirely so. Corn bread was the fathers' chief mainstay of life. Their beverage for breakfast and supper was warm milk fresh from the cow; for dinner it was usually water.[25]

that Father Muños was sent to Saint Rose's by the Order's General in 1828, to "*reëstablish*" a discipline that had existed there, but "had suffered some relaxation" through the "distracting cares of the missionary life." This is a far cry from what Maes would have the learned author to say: that is, no discipline had ever existed at the place. Spalding was led into an error by some notes of Bishop Flaget. Muños was sent to Saint Rose's by Bishop Fenwick, not by the Father General. Neither was his mission to reëstablish discipline.

[25] Father Pius J. Gaddi to Father Wilson, Rome, March 16, 1816 (Archives of Saint Joseph's Priory); Wilson, Kentucky, to Hill, Rome, July 23, 1820 (Propaganda Archives, America Centrale, Vol. iii, No. 138).

From the same document we learn that, owing to poverty, the students, and even the priests, had occasionally to do manual labor. Nevertheless, through economy in time, they managed to carry on classes regularly and to give the young men a good education. Most of them, in addition to the courses ordinarily given in seminaries, knew French and Italian. The fathers (that is, those not engaged in the college) did much missionary work. But the missions were a source of expense rather than of income to the institution. Indeed, they would have been happy had the missions brought in enough to supply the fathers engaged on them with the horses and secular clothing required for that purpose. The greatest drawback to the young province was its extreme indigence, which often made the life of its members quite trying. Yet this did not prevent them from performing all spiritual functions *gratis*. These things, however, observes the Provincial, should not deter the new recruits from accompanying Father Hill to America; for they will still find food and clothing, and with these one should be content. Their labors will bear rich fruit.

Father Wilson's statement is confirmed by a letter of Father Hill who had just arrived from Rome itself. This document is dated November 21, 1821, and is given in the London *Catholic Miscellany*, I, 327-328. He assures us that the diet of the little community was indeed "very plain," and their life "sufficiently austere." That they enjoyed good health, he seems to insinuate, was a blessing from God, who "tempers the wind to the shorn lamb."

Having delivered the tirade which has been laid before the reader, Father Nerinckx proceeds to tell how he had formed an unfavorable opinion of the English Dominicans at Bornheim before he left for America, although he hardly knew them even by name. This impression he received from friends. And to give it the greater weight he assures Bishop Carroll that his informants were among the very best Catholics of Belgium—nay, precisely the men who have been so generous to the American missions. One of them went so far as to request him not to associate with the fathers going to America, should they be on the same boat as he. His friends had told him that, in the very midst of the persecution of all the clergymen who remained loyal

to the Church, the fathers of Bornheim were able, God only knows how, to go abroad as freely as the unfaithful priests who had subscribed to the iniquitous civil constitution of the clergy. Furthermore, these Dominicans managed to buy back their confiscated property, using bonds of the revolutionary republic for that purpose. Father Wilson, he continues, was even elected to public office, was held in high esteem by the prefect of that department, and received the sons of the Church's persecutors into Holy Cross College of which he was president. These things, Father Nerinckx says he was informed, aroused a strong suspicion in the minds of all good Catholics that those friars were in at least tacit agreement with the tyrannical government. In Kentucky, he declares, Father Wilson had spoken in defense of the present deplorable state of the Church in France. For these reasons, the missioner cannot doubt but that men of their stamp (*talis farinae*) should be handled with the greatest precaution. If they have not associated themselves with iniquity, they have at least become scandalously lax.

Father Nerinckx now comes to what is evidently the impelling motive behind his furious assault. It is to prevent the fathers from becoming the directors of Kentucky's future seminary, should they succeed in establishing themselves in the State. But if we may judge from their letters, his worry was without cause; for nothing seems to have been further from their minds. Perhaps he wished to see his fellow-countrymen, or those imbued with Jansenistic principles, in charge of this institution.[26]

We shall let Father Raymond Palmer tell of the conduct of the English friars in Belgium after the revolution. His sober words, besides offering an agreeable contrast to Father Nerinckx's violent declamation, bear the impress of truth and bring conviction:

> After the French had established their government and peace was outwardly restored, some of the fathers, in 1795, returned to Bernhem, but durst not openly settle themselves again in the convent. In 1796

[26] Although the missioner expressly states in this document that he writes unasked (*non rogatus quidem*), Maes, at the end of his rendition of it, puts in the words (and in quotation marks, as if they were a translation): "I feel all the more free, my Lord, in writing to you as I have done, . . . since you expect me to look after the interests of Religion in this region" (MAES, *op. cit.*, p. 176). These last words are not in the letter. See DOCUMENTS, pp. 76–82.

> the possessions of all religious bodies were declared national property and the sale of them was decreed. A commissaire sent to Bernhem valued the property at 24,806 livres; it so happened that five pieces of the best land escaped the man's notice and were not sequestrated. As a compensation the directoire executif offered the fathers [because they were Englishmen] the amount in *bons* [that is, bonds], and although those notes were available only for government purposes and their value very precarious, the fathers took them as they were better than nothing.
>
> The property was brought to auction in April and August, 1797, and the whole was sold to a perfumer of Antwerp for 13,894 livres more than the government valuation. This perfumer was the agent of the English fathers, and so the convent of Bornhem returned to the rightful owners. The government was paid with its bons with an additional sum of about £700. As soon as the fathers had the house back, they formed a small community there and opened the college again. The constitutional oath was tendered to them which they refused; but a trifling bribe offered in the most barefaced manner got over the difficulty. The meanest scoundrels stood at the head of affairs; some whom the fathers had known in the lowest circumstances had thrust themselves by unscrupulous conduct into public notice and held great preferments. . . .[27]

The convent, as Father Palmer informs us, could not again be opened as such. The people, unable to enter the church, gathered in the church-yard for their prayers. Doubtless, the fathers, naturally less molested because they were Englishmen, cautiously administered to the sorrowing faithful. Thus they were a blessing rather than the scandal that Father Nerinckx would have us believe.

When Father Wilson, more than a year afterwards, heard of the accusations that had been made against him personally, he wrote to Bishop Carroll explaining his conduct in Belgium and his remarks in Kentucky, and offered to produce proof of his assertions. His explanation must have given the venerable prelate such satisfaction that he could now hardly have desired the proof, even had he wished it before. From the Dominican's letter we learn that his argument in Kentucky was to call Father Badin's attention to the difference between the accidentals of religion, or discipline, and the essentials, or doctrine. This he did only to defend Pius VII, then so sorely tried by Napoleon Bonaparte, from accusations which the French missionary seemed disposed to lay at the door of the aged and distressed Pontiff.

[27] PALMER, *Life and Times of Philip Thomas Howard, O.P., Cardinal of Norfolk*, pp. 234-35.

Of his relations with the French government at Bornheim the learned friar says simply that, at the request of the bishop, the parish priest of the town and several other clergymen, he accepted, about a year before his departure for America, the position of counsellor to the mayor of Bornheim, a young, scrupulous and inexperienced man. In this capacity he assisted at three meetings of the council, in which were discussed the question of the salaries "for the midwife of our parish" and "for the person who wound up the clock of the parish church, and such like trifles."[28] He did not mention the fact that the fathers could not wear their habits, and for a time were obliged to live in hiding; that they could not reopen their house as a convent; and that they were able to reopen their college was because religious institutes devoted to teaching had not been suppressed by the revolution. All this the bishop knew.

Father Wilson tells Bishop Carroll that he is so conscious of his innocence of the charges made against him that he would not have written this letter, had he not been urged to do so by his brethren. But it should be noted in this connection that Father Nerinckx's sources of information about the Dominicans at Bornheim, in his letter of June 30, 1808, seem to dwindle down to one man; and he is not sure whether it was the dead Mr. De Wolf of Antwerp, or the living Mr. Peemans of Louvain, who had told him the ugly things narrated in the document just discussed.

Shortly after writing this letter, Father Nerinckx refused longer to attend the mission of Holy Mary on the Rolling Fork, where he was not remunerated for his services.[29] Prior to this, he had thought of joining the Trappists who were then in Kentucky. But now his troubles seem to have turned his thoughts in this direction more seriously than ever. The following year, Bishop Carroll, writing at the request of Father Badin to dissuade him from such a purpose, took occasion to say:

> Perhaps it [the inclination to join the Trappists] proceeds from the difference of opinion, and consequently of practice, betwixt you and some of your brother clergymen on certain points of morality. If such be

[28] October 14, 1807 (Baltimore Archives, Case 8 B, L 7).

[29] Father Wilson to Bishop Carroll, August 25, 1806, as in note 5; Father Badin to same, November 20, 1806 (Baltimore Archives, Case 1, H 6).

> the case, you have certainly recollected that this happens everywhere, in all the countries, which I have been in. Often, the rectors of adjoining parishes have imbibed different principles. Each follows those which he approves the best, and as long as they are tolerated by the Church, he suffers his neighbour to pursue them, tho' he himself pursues a different course.[30]

In the meantime, it having been rumored that Father Badin would likely be appointed the first ordinary of Kentucky, complaints of the most emphatic character against that missionary's extreme harshness and severity began to arrive at Baltimore.[31] So matters wore along until June 30, 1808, when Father Nerinckx wrote to Bishop Carroll the letter of which we now speak. It is another outpouring of bitter invective against the friars and the people. In his opinion, things are going from bad to worse; and still more serious consequences are to be feared. He thus sums up his charges under four headings:

1°. The dissensions, arrogance and tumultuous impudence of the people of Kentucky began with the coming of the Dominicans. Why these fathers did not inquire on their arrival, as he had done, what virtues were to be implanted, and what vices eradicated, he cannot understand, unless their aim was either to please the people, or to advance their own interests. He doubts whether they have gained the first purpose; but in temporal matters they have met with fair success. They have done nothing for the common good of religion. Whatever they get, they apply to their house. The church of Saint Ann is in the same state in which he left it. Perhaps they intend to transfer it to Saint Rose's. He fears the same fate for the church which he had intended to erect in Springfield. Saint Ann's Congregation, when he had charge of it, was given to the cultivation of every virtue, and was the most exemplary in the state. But now, he *hears*, all this has passed like a shadow. Marriages with Protestants are contracted with the utmost facility. Dances are permitted in the day time, and are no sin. In Saint Ann's Parish, in Scott County, and on Simpson's Creek, where "the

[30] Bishop Carroll to Father Nerinckx, April 12, 1807 (Baltimore Archives, Case 10, D 2); Father Badin to Bishop Carroll, February 17 and March 14, 1807 (*ibid.*, Case 1, I 1 and 3).

[31] These charges commenced to arrive in Baltimore late in 1807, and continued through a great part of 1808.

cat gut" electrifies the feet at that more comical than evangelical practice, dances and marriages always end in tumult. At times these fathers do some missionary work, but only when there is hope of gain. When there is nothing but labor in view, they claim to be religious only. Again, he would emphatically call them to a stricter religious discipline, and have the General of the Dominicans send to Kentucky some men of his Order imbued with its spirit. Of course he means imbued with Jansenistic views. But now Father Nerinckx is not sure whether it was from Mr. Peemans of Louvain, or Mr. De Wolf ("of happy memory") of Antwerp, that he received the evil reports about the fathers at Bornheim, of which he had spoken in a previous letter.

In reply to the charges under this heading let it be said, first, that Father Nerinckx's own letters show that there had been troubles and loud complaints in Kentucky before the coming of the Dominicans. Of the fathers' zeal and self-sacrifice enough has been said to clear them from these renewed accusations of laxity, of selfishness, of want of religious observance. Of this latter the missionary could have known nothing, for the reason that he kept away from Saint Rose's. Nor is it anywhere stated that the friars made the same exactions on the purses of the people as the other two missionaries. Had they been grasping, it is hardly probable that they would have always been in such dire poverty. Maes' assertion (*op. cit.*, p. 173) that: "Many negligent Christians took a malign pleasure in going to the Dominicans and contributing more for their buildings than even the richest were asked to do for the support of their parish priests," is fiction pure and simple. Secondly: it was quite natural that, in those days of few priests and much to do, Saint Ann's and Springfield, as neither place was more than two miles from Saint Rose's, should be merged into the latter parish. This was a matter of economy for the greater good. Father Nerinckx should have told the bishop this circumstance. So also should he have told him that Simpson's Creek was under Father Badin's care, not that of the Dominicans. And he should have added that, although the superior of the friars had sought to place Father Angier at Saint Francis', Scott County, in compliance with the bishop's request, Father Badin had so

far thwarted this arrangement and attended the parish himself.[32] Thirdly: real history tells us that, in spite of Father Nerinckx's statement, the Cartwright's Creek Settlement, for which Saint Ann's was built, was never more faithful to its religious duties, or in a better spiritual condition, than after it was placed under the administration of the Dominicans. To this day it remains one of the most exemplary parishes in the State. To this day a mixed marriage is almost unheard of in the congregation. As to the lawfulness of decent dances, the Church, through her theologians, speaks for herself.

2°. Under this heading the good man turns his attention to Basil Elder of Baltimore. There lives in your town, he says, a crafty, contemptible fellow. His name is Basil Elder, but it should be Basilisk; that is, a fabled serpent whose very breath was fatal (*Est apud vos versepellis quidam de grege homuncio, Basilius, melius Basiliscus, Elder*). He has emitted his poison even unto these parts. Through his letters, which are handed about to be publicly read (but Father Nerinckx *has not seen any of them*), he has, though "unprovoked by me, heaped insult and injury upon me," until he is held in contempt by all good people and even by the more honest Protestants. "I forgive him from my heart [he continues], for I admit in him the crassest and most stupid ignorance. . . . He who wrote that list of accusations is a brute rather than a man. . . . I most sincerely believe (*sincerissime judico*) such a man utterly unworthy of any sacrament, until it is established beyond all doubt that he has repaired the scandal given. That sneak (*ille tenebrio*) boasts that he has the approbation and endorsement of your Lordship for all, or nearly all, that he says." Father Nerinckx doubts not that this assertion is gratuitious and mendacious. Should it be true, however, and should Elder's letters contain what they *are said* to contain, the missioner does not see how the affair can be remedied, unless the last chapter of the Book of Esther suggest a way.[33]

[32] Badin's interference with the bishop's arrangements for Saint Francis' Parish may be seen in several letters of the day, including some of his own. His officiousness in the matter eventually aroused the venerable prelate's displeasure.

[33] In his rendition of this part of Father Nerinckx's letter Maes (*op. cit.*, p. 178) substitutes "B— E—" for Basil Elder. "B— E—" is also made the instigator of the complaints, for which there is no evidence. The most opprobrious epithets

Doubtless the reader has noticed the extravagance and the lack of charity in this language. They become the more patent, when it is remembered that Basil Elder was an exemplary Catholic and the father of the late saintly Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati. Webb informs us that he was trusted, admired and beloved as a friend by the first seven archbishops of Baltimore.[34]

Basil Elder's relations lived in the Cox's Creek Settlement, now Fairfield, Nelson County. And it was from this section that the greater number, as well as the most damaging, of the complaints were sent to Baltimore against Father Badin who was in charge of this mission. From this it will be seen how unfair and groundless is the following imputation by Father Maes (*op. cit.*, pp. 176-77): "It was especially in these places [that is, in Springfield and Saint Ann's Parish], where his [Father Nerinckx's] influence was no longer felt, that his enemies exerted themselves in the most shameless manner to destroy whatever good he had effected; the Dominicans holding themselves aloof, or being perhaps unable to counteract the evil influences of these rebels."[35]

3°. Under the third heading of his letter Father Nerinckx gives us a list of the accusations against him. As far as he can find out from what has been said or written, and from an examination of his conscience, these are, he says:

---

applied to Elder by Father Nerinckx are suppressed, and the bitterness of the attack further toned down by dividing the paragraph, and putting a part of it on page 181: "*Tali dedicatore*," etc. Basil Elder's identity is still further disguised by a footnote (*op. cit.*, p. 181), which represents him as a Kentuckian who "was in Baltimore at the time, and had had an interview with the Bishop." But Father Badin's letters, as well as the present document, with its "*apud vos*," leave no doubt as to who "B— E—" was, or as to where he lived. The name Basil Elder, although given in full by Father Nerinckx, is again rendered "B— E—" by the same author (*op. cit.*, p. 180), in No. 10 of the accusations against the missionary. Still again (*op. cit.*, p. 186), we find Father Anthony Sedilla given as "Anthony ———." One wonders why all this suppression of the identity of others, whilst the Dominicans are brought out so prominently. The answer to this question we leave to the reader. See DOCUMENTS, p. 87.

[34] WEBB, *op. cit.*, p. 123. See also the *New York Freeman's Journal*, October 23, 1869, and *Character Glimpses of the Most Rev. William Henry Elder*, pp. 11 *ff.*

[35] We have found only one person in Saint Rose's Congregation writing against Father Badin. This was in 1808, and the complaint was about that priest's action in regard to land attached to Saint Ann's. All the other complaints were from places attended by Badin. Some of the "rebels," as Father Maes calls them, afterwards retracted what they had said; but, unfortunately, there are not wanting signs that the retractions were made under some duress.

1. I insist on the people rising at 4 A. M. Rev. Father Fenwick is my accuser on this head, and that is the hour which he himself should keep. But he is deceived when he says that I deny absolution to those who sleep longer. If he knew what the Jesuit Fathers introduced in Paraguay, and the devotions practiced in Belgium, he would say mass at four A. M. for the negro slaves. 2. I promiscuously forbid dances as bad. 3. I prohibit promiscuous visiting between persons of different sexes. 4. I forbid and am opposed to marriages with heretics, etc. 5. Before marriage, I require preparation for the banns and frequentation of the Sacraments. 6. I prescribe rules to be followed in the married state. 7. On Sundays and holy days, I order public prayers to be kept up all the morning, but with intervals of rest. 8. I make continual exactions for the building of churches: fortunately, they do not say that I make them for myself. 9. I forbid excess in clothing and unseemly ornamentation. I will add that I even have women censors of mature age to see that this rule is observed in church. 10. I am too bitter and harsh in giving corrections, etc. Basil Elder calls me a tyrant. 11. Finally, with me is too much confinement [*sic* in his own English; that is, he imposes too much constraint].

As Father Nerinckx then proceeds to glory in the fact that this list represents his ministerial practices, no more need be said here than that they show an excessive severity and Jansenistic rigorism which should have been held in check. It may be remarked, however, that Father Fenwick's character obliges us to believe that he troubled himself about the first complaint no further than to smile and to tell the people that they did not have to obey.

4°. In this paragraph the missioner says that many are greatly afflicted by these accusations and offer to sign a protest against his calumniators. But this he will not allow, as he has wronged no man. He leaves everything to God. He rejoices that no earthly hope brought him to Kentucky, that he has received no temporal reward, and that whatever providence has bestowed upon him he has used for the greater glory of God. The affair grieves him principally because the knowledge of it may make his fellow-countrymen less disposed to come to the mission. Still he will not cease to invite them. Then he asks for an *exeat*.[36]

We do not wish to say that Father Nerinckx did not write

[36] This violent letter is in the *Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 5. See the complete original in DOCUMENTS pp. 85–88.

this letter with a good intention. Yet we venture to believe that the reader can hardly have failed to detect running through all the document a strain of too much sensitiveness; of too pronounced a combative spirit; of too little consideration for others; and of too strong a conviction of being always in the right, as well as of a marked indisposition to allow either honesty, good-will, or the possibility of correct views in those who ventured to think or to act differently from the Belgian missionary. A previous letter shows that he had been greatly irritated on hearing that Father Wilson had spoken unfavorably of the famous Rev. Cornelius Stevens, whom Father Nerinckx considered a second Saint Athanasius.[37] Impartial history, however, by no means places Stevens on so high a pedestal.

Father Badin's letters are at once more numerous and, as a rule, of greater length than those of his friend. One of those to which we wish particularly to call attention was commenced November 20, 1806, and finished February 9, 1807. The other was begun March 10, and completed May 6, 1808.[38] But since to give even a *résumé* of them would not only extend this article to undue length, but would repeat much of what has already been said, suffice it to state that they are of the same personal nature and characterized by the same extravagant language and accusations, and the same lack of proof and charity as the documents which we have reviewed from the pen of Father Nerinckx. Both these zealous missioners were unmerciful to those who did not accord with their views.

Although himself only an ordinary theologian, Father Badin affects to belittle the theological attainments of the early friars and says they are afraid of the learning of Father Nerinckx. But to us the evidence seems to point the other way. More than once the fathers requested Bishop Carroll to use his good offices in order to establish a system of conferences for the clergy in Kentucky, and to suggest some common ground on which

[37] Nerinckx to Carroll, January 1, 1807 (*Baltimore Archives;* Case 8 A, U 3). This document is really only the postscript of a letter that cannot now be found in the archives. Together with a letter of March 21, 1807 (*ibid.*, Case 8 A, U 4), it shows that Father Nerinckx made another onslaught on the Dominicans at this time, and that his principal object was to prevent them from getting charge of the future seminary.

[38] Respectively in the *Baltimore Archives*, Case 1, H 6 and I 6.

they could agree. He did so in letters to Father Badin; but the letters were never shown to the friars, nor their contents made known to them. The conferences were never held.[39] The only author whom Father Badin seemed willing to follow for such a purpose was Antoine, a theologian of a pronouncedly rigorous type whose views pleased those imbued with Jansenistic principles.

Like his friend, Father Badin accuses the early friars of all manner of intrigue, as well as of a covetous, worldly and grasping spirit, lack of zeal and seeking an easy life. They tell the people, he asserts, of the want of harmony among the clergy; let it be understood that the Dominicans, because religious, are not subject to the bishop; declare that the other missioners are too severe; and otherwise sow the seeds of trouble and discord. But again the evidence seems to point in the opposite direction. In one place, the French missionary, evidently to make his charges the more personal and effective, goes so far as to send Bishop Carroll what he calls a quotation from a letter of Fenwick casting a slur upon the Jesuits. On the margin of the document at the side of this assertion, the prelate has written: "Is not this a breach of private correspondence? Is it revealed to me for any beneficial purpose?" But, we think, the bishop had no cause for apprehension. Fenwick's letters and character, no less than his dealings with the Society of Jesus, offer the strongest rebuttal to Father Badin's charge. Indeed, that nothing really injurious to the reputation of these early friars occurs in the manuscript literature of the time, is certainly proof positive that they were men of edifying life and truly priestly character. And in this connection, it should be further noted that the Frenchman's letters reveal not only great love and admiration for his Belgian friend, but implicit confidence in his judgment. They show clearly enough how well founded were the often expressed fears of the Dominicans, that the Flemish clergymen's influence served to bring into fuller play the ultra severe and Jansenistic principles of Father Badin, which lay at the root of the discontent among the people, the complaints they sent to the bishop against him, and his charges against the friars.

Of Father Wilson's learning sufficient has been said. So also,

[39] This is shown by several of Fenwick's letters to Carroll.

though not so profound or so widely read as he, were his colleagues all college-bred men, and possessed of considerable erudition. Like Wilson, Tuite and Angier had won academic honors. Both were lectors in sacred theology. Again, apart from what has already been said, and the hallowed memories in which they have ever been held by their later brethren, let it be noted, in opposition to Father Badin's gratuitous assertions, that it would be difficult today to find four priests more disinterested than were those four early friars in Kentucky. Certainly they did not deserve all this vituperation. This is the more evident from the fact that the gentle and humble and holy and unselfish Fenwick is singled out as the principal offender—doubtless because the French missionary imagines the future bishop to be still the superior, although he had voluntarily laid down the reins of authority months before. In some of the French missioner's correspondence Angier and Tuite are acknowledged to be gentlemen of pleasing ways and polished manners.

A later document shows that Bishop Carroll was much displeased with many of Badin's actions, and with his letter of March 10-May 6, 1808. The missionary was evidently taken severely to task. In spite of this, however, he sought to justify himself in his characteristic way. The result was a letter begun August 29, and finished October 7, 1808. It is from this that we learn of the bishop's displeasure. It is a document of more than thirty-nine closely written pages, in which its writer endeavors to defend himself by minute explanations, a renewal of his former charges, and the assistance of select friends.[40]

Through all the unpleasantness the friars wrote but seldom—only when obliged to do so through duty, charity or self-defense. Their letters, calm, temperate and judicial, even under the trying circumstances, show not only a broad and kindly spirit, but much self-possession. More than once, as has been stated, they requested the bishop to designate some middle course in which all could concur. On the other hand, Fathers Badin and Nerinckx, stern, inflexible and unable to see any views except their own, wanted no compromise. Neither of them, as far as we have been able to find, ever sought the advice of the bishop in the matters under dispute. Nor did they follow his suggestions. They left nothing untried to have him condemn the Dominicans.

[40] Baltimore Archives, Case 1, I 10.

That Bishop Carroll held all these priests of Kentucky in high esteem is certain.[41] It is also certain that he sought to bridge over their differences. His marginal notes and underlining on the letters from Fathers Badin and Nerinckx show that he was often perplexed, if not vexed. Precisely what he said in his letter to the French missionary that brought forth Badin's long reply of August 29-October 7, 1808, cannot now be known. But the fact that the unpleasantness, although the two clergymen continued to hold their rigid principles, begins to wane from this time, would indicate that the good prelate must have insisted on more charity and more moderation. Perhaps, too, the part the Dominicans took, in 1809, in helping Father Nerinckx to escape the administratorship of Louisiana, to which he had been appointed, had its share in the establishment of a better understanding. By the time of Bishop Flaget's arrival in Kentucky, Father Nerinckx, it would seem, had learned to esteem the friars. And during his last years in Kentucky Father Badin appears to have regarded them as his best friends. Indeed, while abroad, the French missioner made two unsuccessful attempts to join the Order of Saint Dominic for the American provinces. Failing to become a member of the First Order, he made his profession as a Dominican tertiary, and returned to the United States to labor under Fenwick, who was the bishop of Cincinnati.

The following words of Father Wilson, written to Bishop Carroll some seven months after the friar reached the missions, present, we think, a fair idea of the state of affairs in Kentucky at the time of the arrival of the Dominicans in the state.

> The men [he says], both young and old, of this poor country are very shy of Priests. A little good nature will, I hope, in time bring many to their duty. Some already drop in by degrees. Not one in twenty frequent the Sacraments—few since they left Maryland. They will not be driven, they say. And indeed, with good words, they will do almost anything for you. Considering their poverty, they are beyond expectation generous in our regard. I hope Almighty God will bless their good-

[41] Of the Dominicans, for instance, Bishop Carroll, writing to Father Concanen, November 21, 1806, says that they are "exceedingly and deservedly beloved" by all; and that he views them "as choice auxiliaries conveyed hither by the special appointment of Providence to instruct the young and the old, to extend our holy religion and preserve by their lessons the integrity of Catholic faith" (Archives of the Dominican General, as above). This letter was written when the unpleasantness was at its height, and there is absolutely no indication that the great prelate ever changed his opinion.

will and desire of seeing Priests, as they call them, of their own. I hope we shall agree with Mr. Badin, whose principles, with those of Mr. Nerinckx, are somewhat rigid in many points. But this will be an affair of some prudence and forbearance.[42]

The characteristic of the people of Kentucky noted by the learned divine, more than a century ago, remains a characteristic of them to this day. No more stubborn people can be found anywhere if one attempts to coerce them. One would look in vain for a more docile people if those who should guide them are but kind and lead the way. Father Nerinckx also remarked this trait of the Catholics in Kentucky. Had he and Father Badin adapted themselves to the spirit of their flocks, doubtless not only would their ministrations have been more acceptable, but the fruits of their labors at once more abundant and more lasting. In his famous letter of June 2, 1806, the Belgian missionary says to Bishop Carroll:

Nevertheless, I will add this in favor of these people: however refractory very many of them are, they offer, in my opinion, much hope for good; if the directors of their souls, be they ever so exacting (or, if you will, even strict), are only kind and gentle, and show sympathy for their weakness. Harshness terrifies and repels them; but paternal piety wins even the unwilling.[43]

Father Nerinckx seldom mentions the names of those with whom he had had trouble, but Father Badin was less cautious. In this way we learn that their differences were with some of the best and most influential Catholics in the state. Such, for instance, were the Spaldings, the Hamiltons, the Lancasters, the Elders and the Simpsons. In speaking of these families, Father Badin even surpasses the acerbity of Father Nerinckx. A fair appreciation of the French missionary's character and practices may be found in the following words from his own pen:

Mr. Nerinckx says that I mean well, but that, in his opinion, I take the wrong means to gain the confidence of the people. My success in that difficult [affair] and many other affairs for fifteen years undoes his opinion.[44]

Attention has been called to the kindly attitude and spirit of the Dominicans, and to their views of the unpleasantness. Let us now give two concrete examples of this as exemplified in Fenwick. Writing to Rev. Robert A. Angier, who was still in

[42] July 25, 1806 (*Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 B, L 5).
[43] See note 20.
[44] See note 40.

Maryland, he tells his friend that he may have Father Badin as a companion on his way to Kentucky. Then he writes:

> He [Badin] has not yet offered me any of the church lands he once talked so much of. He even objects to giving us the little tract belonging to the chapel which we serve, and which was bought for the Priest who should serve it. . . . For the peace of the Church here, and for the sake of harmony among us, I wish you would request of Bishop Carroll to examine into his and Mr. Nerinckx's whole practice, and to require a clear and minute statement of the whole—and of ours—, and to pronounce whether they or we are singular in our practice, and which of us must reform.[45]

The other example is contained in the closing words of a letter of Fenwick to Father Concanen. The statement was written more than two months after the selection of a bishop for Kentucky and is the only one in which the friar so much as refers to the affair in all his correspondence with Rome. Here he writes:

> I have never mentioned to Rev. Mr. Badin that I had leave to admit him in our Order, as I found, on my [second] arrival in the country, his attachment and zeal for us were no longer the same as at our first meeting. His mind, we believe, was changed by associating with a new missioner from Flanders, Rev. Mr. Nerinx, who seems to have imbibed prejudices against us, and to have instilled them into the mind of Mr. Badin. Mr. Badin is a zealous and active man on the mission, and will likely do better under his own control and the Bishop's than in our Order. He is generally more zealous than prudent—in fine, much of a Frenchman. Consequently I think he is an unfit man to be Bishop of Kentucky. I wish him not to be, for our sakes, and for religion in general. Bishop Carroll, in a letter to me, says he fears his nomination will be unpopular, though he was in the first place, recommended among others, in consequence of his zeal and long service in Kentucky, having been [for] some time the only Priest there. I do not mean or wish, dear Sir, to hurt the good man in your opinion, but to say, though he is a man of real merit, yet [he] is unfit to fill a Bishop's place, on account of his overbearing, hasty temper, and his harsh, strict and rigid practice in Sacro Tribunali. This, I know, is Bishop Carroll's opinion. If you have any influence in the Pope's Council, you will serve us and the Church in Kentucky by preventing his nomination. The good Doctor Carroll is our real friend.[46]

With this quotation from a document which is a fair exemplar of all the friars' letters on the question, we may close an episode which, even if it is somewhat sad, need offer no cause for shock

---

[45] Fenwick, Kentucky, to Rev. R. A. Angier, Maryland [1807] (Archives of Saint Joseph's Province).

[46] Lexington, Kentucky, July 10, 1808 (Archives of the Dominican Master-General, Codex xiii, 731).

or scandal. As long as men, even clergymen (be they ever so good), remain in this land of trial and probation, such things will occasionally happen. Saints Augustine and Jerome are an example in point. Fathers Badin and Nerinckx were ever the attacking parties; the others necessarily on the defensive. We have dwelt on the unpleasantness at some length, much against our liking, only because misrepresentation, the interest of true history and a just defense obliged us to such a course. Though the affair can hardly fail to throw something of a shadow on the names of two ambassadors of Christ which we should like to see glow with all possible luster, it casts no serious reflection on their character. Neither does it detract from their reputation for piety and apostolic zeal.

Few priests, we venture to believe, can examine the documents in the case and fail to pronounce the teachings and practice of the Dominicans not only kindlier, but saner, more Catholic and better calculated to bear good fruits. Unlike Father Howlett, who deftly insinuates that it is a question whether these friars were a real benefit to the missions, those in possession of first-hand evidence will be constrained to declare the presence of the Dominicans in Kentucky at that time an undisguisable blessing to both the Church and the people of the state.[47] That they were regarded as such a blessing by the Catholics at large, no bad judges, we think undeniable history. As tells us a traveller, writing from Elizabethtown, Kentucky, January 14, 1825, Fenwick and Wilson, the two fathers specially censured by the Belgian and French missionaries, were idols in the State. They won the hearts of all—the former by his zeal and "engaging and unaffected manners," the latter by his "moderation and extensive ecclesiastical learning."[48]

It is with a feeling of no little relief that we now close this ungrateful article. It has been written, we repeat, solely in vindication of good men who have been unjustly maligned.

Rev. Victor F. O'Daniel, O.P., S.T.M.,
Washington, D. C.

[47] Howlett, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx*, pp. 163-164. Although this biographer is not so unfair as Father Maes, one must needs be blind not to read his thoughts between the lines. It is indeed strange that neither of these authors could find time to say a single good word of the future bishop of Cincinnati and his companions in religion.

[48] *United States Catholic Miscellany*, July 20, 1825.

THE JESUITS IN BAJA CALIFORNIA, 1697-1768

The occupation of either of the Californias by the sea route, rather than by following the line of overland progress to the junction of the Gila and Colorado rivers (thence branching out southward to the peninsula and northwestward to Monterey), represented a departure from the normal course, necessitating extraordinary efforts for a successful achievement. Yet both regions were settled and maintained as an overseas venture, and one of them, Baja California, served in some degree as a preliminary base for the acquisition of the other. Credit for the occupation of Baja California belongs jointly to the Jesuits and the Spanish government, which cooperated to bring it about and especially to maintain the initial gains made at their own expense by the Jesuits. The Jesuits, however, are entitled to principal recognition as the active agents of the crown who succeeded in an enterprise which for nearly two centuries had had an almost unbroken record of failure.

The disappointment of the government over the outcome of the Atondo colony in 1685 disposed it for the moment against incurring further expense in the Californias, but it was almost immediately reminded of the desirability of Spanish occupation by the appearance of *Pichilingues*. In this case the "deep-voiced" foreigners were English freebooters under Swan and Townley, who came up the coast in 1685–1686 in search of the Manila galleon. Swan tried to reach Cape San Lucas, but failed on account of the age-long difficulty of the contrary winds. He therefore turned about and made for the East Indies. The galleon was not taken, but the government was again roused to action. It was believed, however, that a new method of conquest should be tried, and therefore in 1686 an offer of 40,000 *pesos* a year was made to the Jesuits to undertake it; since the conversion of the Indians, rather than wealth in pearls or the development of rich lands, was their primary aim, it was hoped that they might succeed where others had not been able to do so. The royal government might indeed have commanded the Jesuits to do this work, but in the nature of things it was essential to

have their free consent. Thus when the Jesuits declined, on grounds of the wretchedness of the land and the small number of Indians, the government did not press the matter. The suggestion was soon to bear fruit, however. It was after the Jesuit refusal that the government made the already mentioned plan to finance Atondo again, a plan which came to naught.

The revival of the idea of a Jesuit conquest was due to two religious of that order, Fathers Eusebio Francisco Kino and Juan María Salvatierra. As a member of the Atondo expedition Father Kino had developed an enthusiasm for Jesuit penetration into the Californias which became one of the abiding aims of his life. Upon his return from the San Bruno colony he had been sent to Sonora, where in 1687 he had crossed the Altar River to found a mission at Dolores in Pimería Alta. It was there that he met Salvatierra, who had been sent out by the Jesuit Order as *visitador*, or inspector, of the missions in that region. Kino imbued Salvatierra with his enthusiasm, and the latter put himself at the head of a movement for a Jesuit occupation of Baja California. The time was unusually unpropitious, for Spain was then prostrate before France in a great war which was not yet finished but was virtually decided. Not only the government but also the higher Jesuit officials opposed the plan, but in 1696 help came from the fountain-head of Jesuit power. In that year Father Santaella, General of the Order, was in Mexico City. He favored the project. It was therefore not hard to procure a license from the government, which had so long desired the achievement of this very aim, but the proviso was attached to its consent that the Jesuits must find the funds. Early in 1697 Salvatierra was empowered to raise them, if he could, by private subscription. Salvatierra was assisted in his project by Father Juan de Ugarte, a member of the Jesuit college of Mexico City, and it was this individual who now began his important services on behalf of the Californias by suggesting the establishment of the Pious Fund of the Californias. This institution provided for the collection of funds from pious individuals and for their employment in the founding and maintenance of missions. The royal license to the Jesuits, dated February 5, 1697, called for the occupation of the Californias by the Jesuits at their own expense (assisted by the Pious Fund). The most striking feature of the contract was the

provision that the entire enterprise was to be under Jesuit control; not only were they to have charge of spiritual interests, but they were also to hire and command the soldiers and such other officials or helpers as they might need. This was something new in California history, though it had been tried elsewhere in Spanish dominions, notably in Paraguay, with success. The one check on Jesuit authority was the requirement that the conquest should be made in the name of the king and subject to the orders of the viceroy or other higher representatives of the crown.

Salvatierra met with many discouragements in getting his expedition under way. He found that insufficient provisions had been supplied. Then Fathers Kino and Piccolo, whom he had intended to take with him, did not appear at the rendezvous; Kino was detained permanently in Pimería Alta, but Piccolo eventually joined Salvatierra, though not until after the latter had reached Baja California. Though affairs were not in such a state as he could have wished them to be, Salvatierra resolved to go anyway; so he gathered together his "army" of six men and started. The voyage was made in two small crafts, which endeavored to cross from the Sinaloa coast to the peninsula. Salvatierra's boat got across the gulf in a single day, sailing on October 10, 1697, and arriving on the 11th. The other boat was caught in a storm, and did not reach its destination until November 15, over a month later.

On October 18, after a week's search, Salvatierra picked out a site about a third of the way up the peninsula which Captain Romero said he had visited two years before—on a voyage of which otherwise there is no record, unless Romero was in fact referring to the Itamarra voyage of 1694. At this place, to which the name Loreto was given, was now established the first permanent European settlement of the Californias. A fort was made, with the provisions as bulwarks, and a tiny swivel-gun was mounted. There were many natives in the vicinity, and they helped in the work of preparing the camp, receiving gifts of porridge and maize. Salvatierra was a very busy man in the early days of the colony. He was priest, officer, sentry, governor of the province, and cook for the army rolled into one. Yet he found time to study the native tongue and to conduct

religious services from the first. The Indians were invited to attend, and were given an extra allotment of porridge when they did. Trouble soon developed, however, on the part of the unconverted. They wanted as much porridge as the converts received, and furthermore began to steal things about the camp. Their dissatisfaction at length reached such proportions that on the first of November they issued demands for porridge. For several days the Spaniards thought it best to accede to their demands, as the second ship had not arrived, and their forces were hopelessly insufficient. Meanwhile they became exhausted with watching, for it was evident that the Indians, emboldened by their success, planned to rush the camp. At last, on November 12, the attack came. The Spaniards felt that it was time to use the swivel-gun. They did so, and one famous shot was fired—but the result was very different from what they could have hoped. The gun burst and killed two Spaniards, while the Indians received no harm. Seeing what had taken place the Indians charged. All seemed over now, but the Spaniards prepared to sell their lives dearly. They fired their muskets point-blank at the Indians, and several of the latter were killed. A new light dawned upon the Indians, and they came to a sudden unanimous, and simultaneous decision to run the other way. The battle was over. The next day the Indians sued for peace. Two days later, on the 15th, the second boat (the one which had left Sinaloa at the same time as Salvatierra's) reached Loreto, and on the 23d, the first boat (which had been sent back to New Spain) came in, bringing Father Piccolo. Success now seemed likely. All the Indians appeared to want conversion, and manifestly desired porridge, but Salvatierra insisted upon more instruction and greater proofs of their sincerity. The conquerors were now eighteen in number, two religious, seven soldiers, five sailors, and four Christian Indians from the mainland—a force that was large enough to cope with the Indians of the neighborhood, numerous as they were.

Salvatierra's rectorship, or presidency, of the Baja California missions (carrying with it the government of the province) lasted until his death, in 1717. The events of these twenty years are typical of frontier life and are representative also of the course of affairs in the later period of Jesuit rule. The first five years

were a particularly crucial period, for the entire weight of responsibility fell upon Salvatierra and his co-workers at this time, without more aid from the king than the royal good will. The Pious Fund did especially effective service in these years, with the result that the number of soldiers was increased, supplies made adequate and regular in shipment, and more buildings erected. In 1699 the mission of San Javier was founded south of Loreto, at a fertile site, and Father Piccolo went there as missionary. In the early years the Indians were occasionally hostile, being stirred to resistance by their native priests, or medicine-men, whose profession was of course frowned upon by the Jesuits. But the fiery Captain Tortolero proved himself to be a Californian Miles Standish and was able to keep the Indians in hand. They displayed no enthusiasm for conversion, however; on Palm Sunday of 1698 Salvatierra planned to represent a dinner of the twelve apostles, with Indians filling the rôle of the apostles, but only two Indians put in an appearance. There were also the inevitable quarrels of religious and military, especially between Salvatierra and Tortolero's successor, Mendoza, though in this case the Jesuits clearly had authority. Mendoza wanted to employ more summary methods against the Indians and also to use the soldiers in fishing for pearls. Despite the risk involved, Salvatierra did not hesitate to settle the matter by discharging eighteen of his thirty soldiers.

The most serious difficulty arose over the inadequacy of the Pious Fund for the needs of the colony, and furthermore the amount of gifts to the Fund fell away, due to the charges of the disappointed soldiery and the pearl-fishers. It is to be noticed that obscure seekers of pearls were a constant factor in the history of the province. The Jesuits complained against them, because they forced the Indians to dive for pearls, and consequently the religious would not sell provisions to these hunters of under-sea treasure. The government, however, encouraged the pearl-fishers, and by a decree of 1703 waived the old idea of the monopoly; the effective occupation of the Californias, by whatever means it might be brought about, was what the government wanted. When it became evident that the Jesuits could not sustain themselves without royal aid, the king and his councillors came to the rescue. Philip V himself attended a session

of the Council of the Indies in 1702 at which it was decided to grant a subsidy of 6,000 pesos a year and two additional missionaries (naturally, at royal expense). Shortly afterward an additional 7,000 pesos, thirty soldiers, and religious vestments were added by the king; and in later years the royal subsidy reached as high as 30,000 pesos a year, thus providing for the soldiers, sailors, and missionaries. With this aid the Pious Fund was able to furnish the rest. It is to be noted that there was almost no financial return on the royal investment and that expensive wars in Europe were all along taxing the treasury to its uttermost. Yet the Spanish government, though occasionally behindhand in its payments, made what was, for the times, a generous allowance to maintain and extend the conquests in the Californias, primarily because of their strategic importance with reference to the rich kingdom of New Spain.

Another important factor of a permanent variety was the difficulty of communications with the mainland. Many instances of delays and wreck occasioned by the storms of the Gulf of California have already been noted. In Salvatierra's time about one ship a year was lost by wreck. Salvatierra became convinced that it would be much better to develop a supply-route by way of Sonora, and in 1701 visited Kino in Pimería Alta to discuss the matter. As a result, plans were made for joint expeditions from Sonora and Baja California to see whether there were a practicable trail. It was impossible to do this by boat, as the number of wrecks left the Jesuits with an insufficient fleet of vessels, and the contrary winds were too difficult a factor to overcome readily. Explorations were made by land to the end of Jesuit rule, but never quite reached the Colorado from the side of Baja California or the settled part of the peninsula from the side of Sonora. It is important, however, that the need for such a route was recognized; Baja California was in fact at the extremity of an overland advance, occupied as the result of special circumstances before the intervening spaces.

The greatest of the Baja California Jesuits, undoubtedly, was Father Salvatierra, but second only to him stood Father Juan de Ugarte. It was Ugarte who organized the work of the Pious Fund, but he was not content with the task of administering that institution; he wanted to be an active toiler in the

field. So in 1701 he came to Loreto. Father Piccolo had just been driven away from San Javier by the Indians, but Ugarte went there to restore the mission. Moreover, confiding in his great strength, for he was a giant in stature, he sent back the soldiers who had gone there with him. His reestablished the mission and, as the site was fertile, put the Indians to work at agriculture. The experiment,which had not previously been tried, was a success, and in course of time San Javier was able to produce a surplus for use at the other missions. Ugarte was a man who radiated enthusiasm, and he was able to succeed where others would have failed. Patient, as a rule, he could also exhibit a picturesque wrath. On one occasion he took an Indian by the hair and swung him around his head, and on another seized by the hair two Indians who were fighting and dashed them to the ground. His bountiful courage was particularly useful in 1701, the year of his arrival. Provisions got so low that even Salvatierra was ready to abandon the province. Ugarte opposed and said that he would stay, whatever the others might do. All stayed therefore. Very soon they were reduced to eating roots, but a ship came in time to save them.

Naturally, upon the death of Salvatierra, Ugarte was appointed to succeed him, and he ruled until 1730, when he died at the age of seventy years. His term of office was one of great munificence to the Pious Fund, with the result that more missions were founded and the establishments generally placed on a secure basis. Ugarte resolved to solve the riddle of the gulf, if gulf it were. First it was necessary to build a ship, for those which plied between the mainland and Loreto had proved unequal to the northward voyage. Scouring the land for timber, Ugarte found a grove in an almost inaccessible ravine. The builder said that it was not suitable for a ship, but Ugarte cut it anyway, and hauled it for a hundred miles over mountain ranges to a mission on the coast. The ship was built, and named appropriately the *Triunfo de la Cruz* (Triumph of the Cross). In this boat the venerable rector, then sixty-one years of age, made a voyage up the gulf, in 1721, taking an Englishman, a certain William Strafford (called Guillermo Estrafort in the Spanish), as pilot. Ugarte proved that the sheet of water upon which he sailed was a gulf. Yet so persistent were the old ideas that the

voyage had to be repeated by Father Consag in 1746. Then at length the legend of California's insularity was overthrown forever.

A serious Indian revolt broke out in 1734. The Indians of the Cape San Lucas region had always been unruly, and particularly objected to the Jesuit efforts to deprive them of their institution of polygamy. There were only three Jesuits and six soldiers in the south when the rebellion began, and two of the former and four of the latter, together with many Indian converts, were killed. In 1735, when a boat from the Manila galleon put in at Cape San Lucas, thirteen Spaniards were massacred. The news of these events spread through the peninsula, and the Indians of the north seemed on the point of rising, wherefore all the missions, save that of Loreto, were temporarily abandoned in 1735. Sixty hard-fighting Yaqui Indians were brought over from Sonora, and they saved the situation for a time. Later in the year Governor Huydobro of Sonora came to the peninsula and decisively defeated the Indians of the south. As a result, the revolt in the north died before it had fairly broken out, and that of the south lost force, though the Indians of that quarter continued to drive off cattle and to commit other depredations for some ten years more. Abandonment of the province had been averted, however.

In 1768 the Jesuits were deprived of their position in the peninsula. Before relating how this came about, it is well at this point to summarize their achievements in Baja California. As a recent work puts it:

> During their seventy years' sojourn in Lower [or Baja] California, the Jesuits had charted the east coast and explored the east and west coasts of the Peninsula and the islands adjacent thereto; they had explored the interior to the thirty-first parallel of north latitude[1] in a manner that has never been excelled; they had brought about the institution of the Pious Fund; they had founded twenty-three—including the chapel of Jesus del Monte—mission establishments, of which fourteen had proven successful;[2] they had erected structures of stone and beautified them; they had formulated a system of mission life never thereafter surpassed; they had not only instructed the Indians in religious matters, but had taught them many of the useful arts; they had made a network of open trails, con-

[1] About a hundred miles south of the present international boundary.

[2] Two of the fourteen were abandoned by the successors of the Jesuits.

necting the missions with each other and with Loreto; they had taken scientific and geographical notes concerning the country and prepared ethnological reports on the native races; they had cultivated and planted the arable lands and inaugurated a system of irrigation. . . . Considering the abundance of level land, the water and tens of thousands of Indians about them, the establishment by the Franciscans [at a later time] of twenty-one missions in Upper [or Alta] California during the fifty-four years preceding the passage of the Secularization Act, is no circumstance to the peninsular work of the Jesuits.

Finally, the Jesuits of California were men of high education, many of them of gentle birth; of their labors in the Peninsula it has been said with truth that 'remote as was the land and small the nation, there are few chapters in the history of the world on which the mind can turn with so sincere an admiration.'"[3]

Aside from the mission-presidio at Loreto and the other missions there were few settlements in Baja California where Spaniards lived. The Jesuits always resisted the entry of any whites other than themselves and their mission guards; they even opposed, with success, several royal projects for the founding of presidios on the west coast. Their idea, here as in Paraguay, was that the conversion and civilization of the native was the prime reason for their presence and that these aims would best be attained if the selfish interests of white settlers were not allowed to complicate the situation. There was a sprinkling of miners, however, in the south, and, as already noted, the pearl-fishers continued to visit the coasts. It remains to deal in somewhat more detail with the Pious Fund.

The Pious Fund of the Californias, founded by Salvatierra and Ugarte in 1697, came to be, eventually, one of the principal supports of the missions of both Baja and Alta California. The royal treasury never provided enough for the needs of the missions, which could not have been sustained without a much larger governmental grant if it had not been for the assistance of the Pious Fund; for the first few years, indeed, the Pious Fund was the sole reliance of the Jesuits. At the outset the method of handling was for the donors to pay over the interest merely, on sums that they had given but retained in their possession. Thus, a grant of 10,000 pesos, which was usually regarded as the capital required for the support of one mission,

[3]North, Arthur Walbridge, *The Mother of California* (San Francisco and New York [1908]), pp. 44-45.

entailed payment of 500 pesos a year as interest to the Jesuit administrator in Mexico City. One donor went bankrupt, however, and from the year 1716 the funds were paid over in entirety and reinvested, usually in ranches. The greatest benefactor was the Marques de Villapuente. In addition to providing sums for the founding of a number of missions, he gave several hundred thousand acres of land in Tamaulipas, with all the flocks and buildings upon them. A certain Josefa Paula de Argüelles gave nearly 200,000 pesos, and a member of the great Borja (or Borgia) family, María de Borja, Duquesa de Gandia, gave 62,000. The fund reached a total of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 pesos, and produced at a rate of about 5 per cent. A Jesuit procurator managed the estates and bought and shipped goods to the missionaries in the peninsula.

After the expulsion of the Jesuits had been decided upon in 1767, the Pious Fund was taken over by the government, but was managed as a separate financial institution, with a view to carrying out the objects of the original donors. It was henceforth applied to both Californias. Occasionally, too, funds were devoted to other than purely religious objects, as in the case of the expeditions of 1769 and 1775–1776 to Alta California, both of which were provided for, in part, out of the Pious Fund. In 1836, the Mexican government, which had succeeded Spain in exercise of sovereignty over the Californias, passed a law that the Fund should be applied toward the expenses of a bishopric of the Californias, which, with papal assent, it was proposed to establish. Thus the religious were deprived of any further utilization of the fund. In 1842 the Mexican government reassumed control, but announced that it would employ the proceeds to promote the civilization and conversion of the savages. Later in the same year the separate estates of the Pious Fund were sold, and the moneys obtained were incorporated in the Mexican treasury, but the government made formal acknowledgment of an indebtedness for religious objects in the Californias to the extent of 6 per cent a year on the amount it had received.

When the United States took over Alta California in 1848, Mexico ceased to make further payments on behalf of that territory, and for many years they lapsed. In 1868, a commission met to adjust claims between the United States and Mexico,

and while it was still in session the Catholic authorities of California put in a claim, in 1870, for a portion of the income of the Pious Fund—so much as would normally have been Alta California's share. The United States entered the claim, but as no agreement with Mexico could be reached the matter was submitted to an umpire in the person of Sir Edward Thornton. This gentleman rendered a decision in 1875, calling for payment by Mexico of 6 per cent annually on one-half the value of the fund, on the theory that Alta and Baja California were equally entitled. His decision covered the twenty-one year period from 1848 to 1869, and required payment by Mexico of $904,070.99, or $43,050.99 a year. Mexico paid, but announced that any future claim for arrears would be inadmissible, a contention with which the United States did not agree. In 1891 the United States put in a claim for the arrears since 1869, but Mexico declined to honor the claim. In 1902, however, the two countries consented to a submission of the case to the arbitral tribunal at the Hague—the first case ever acted upon by that body. The court gave a unanimous decision that Mexico should pay the accrued interest, which by that time amounted to $1,420,682.67, and also that Mexico should forever pay over the sum of $43,050.99 each year on the second of February. The money is payable to the United States, which of course recognizes its obligation to give the full amount to the Catholic Church in California. Mexico has again fallen in arrears, and the matter of the Pious Fund has taken its place as one of the perennial unpaid claims of this country against Mexico. As for the share due Baja California, Mexico has long since ceased to make payments. Thus strangely does the course of history take its way. Who could have foreseen such a varied career for that heritage from the missionary zeal of Salvatierra and Ugarte, the Pious Fund of the Californias!

In 1767, the Spanish government issued a decree expelling the Jesuits from all of their dominions. The causes for this action had scarcely anything to do with Jesuit activities in Baja California, though there, as elsewhere, charges were filed against them. It was merely part of a world-wide movement in Catholic countries against the Jesuits, growing largely out of a fear that the Jesuits were planning a great revolution against the absolute

monarchs of Europe. Portugal and France had already expelled the Jesuits, and Naples followed the lead of these countries and Spain in 1767; indeed the Pope was induced to suppress the Jesuit Order in 1773, though it was later restored. It is therefore futile to go into the question of the justice of this decision as affecting the Jesuits of Baja California, as the complaints of their detractors, which were in a great part false or very greatly exaggerated, had no real bearing on the case. In Baja California, as in all other Spanish domains, great secrecy was observed in carrying out the decree, and no hint of what was coming was given. In September, 1767, Captain Gaspar de Pertolá (a native of Catalonia) arrived in the province with a commission as governor. He called the Jesuits together, and on February 3, 1768, they were sent out of the peninsula. The Indians, it seems, made great manifestations of grief, and well they might, for their future in other hands was to be less happy than it had been under Salvatierra and his successors.

The Franciscans of the College of San Fernando,[4] Mexico City, had been offered the California field in June, 1767, and had accepted, but it was not until April, 1768, that its first missionaries actually arrived in the peninsula. Meanwhile, the missions had been turned over to military commissioners, who gave very little thought to the Indians and very much to a search for the vast treasure that the Jesuits were reputed to have accumulated. As a result the missions were nearly ruined, and the Indians were left in sad straits, while little or no treasure was found. At the head of the Franciscans who arrived in the spring of 1768 was Junípero Serra, the appointee of the college as president of the missions, then in his fifty-fifth year. The conditions under which he took up his presidency were very different from those of the Jesuit era. Not only was the government of the province forever removed from mission control, but also the temporalities of the missions—that is, the flocks, crops, and economic resources

[4] The College of San Fernando was not a "college" as that word is ordinarily understood in this country. It was one of several Franciscan institutions, such as the colleges of Queretaro, Jalisco, and Zacatecas, which served as an administrative center for missionary work and as a home for missionaries without employment or for those who had retired from active service. The College of San Fernando, which was destined to supply all of the missionaries of Alta, California, in the Spanish era and most of those in the Mexican, was founded in 1734.

in general—were left in the hands of the military commissioners. Only the church properties and spiritual authority were to be in charge of the Franciscans. The military men had proved to be self-seeking or else incompetent, so that the missions seemed doomed to fail. Not having food or clothing to give the Indians, the missionaries could not attract the unconverted or even hold the former protégés of the Jesuits. Later, in 1768, José de Gálvez, *visitador* (or royal inspector) of all New Spain, arrived in the peninsula, and one of his first reforms was to give back the temporalities to missionary control. With this, the new regime in the Californias, that of the typical frontier province, may fairly be said to have been installed.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN, Ph.D.,
University of California,
Berkeley, Cal.

MISCELLANY

THE EARLIEST RECORD ON THE FRANCISCAN MISSIONS IN AMERICA

(*Contributed by Rev. Livarius Oliger, O.F.M., Munich, Bavaria*)

Much has been published by different religious Orders with a view to furthering our knowledge on the early efforts of converting the aborigines of America. The movement, indeed, owing to the profound religious sense of the age, started very early, and if there is no record of any priest accompanying Columbus on his first expedition, we know for certain that on his second journey to the West Indies, he had already a Vicar-Apostolic with him, in the person of the Minim friar, Bernard Boil.

As to the Franciscans, I leave aside the question of Juan Perez, whether or not that noteworthy Spanish friar accompanied the great discoverer to the new hemisphere on one of his first expeditions. What I want to present to the American scholar in general, and to the readers of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW in particular, is the contemporary account of the first Franciscan Missions in America, as it was written down at Nürnberg between 1506 and 1509 by the Franciscan Chronicler Nicholas Glassberger. Curiously enough, this account, although of the highest value and printed since 1887, seems to have escaped the attention of most Franciscan scholars on things American. Bonaventure Hammer, for instance, does not mention it,[1] nor does Zephyrin Engelhardt in the general introduction to his work on the Franciscan Missions in California.[2] The only writer, so far as I know, to use the valuable contribution of Glassberger, is Heribert Holzapfel, O.F.M., in his instructive *Manual of Franciscan History*.[3]

Before entering into details, it will not be out of place to say a few words about Nicholas Glassberger, the author of the record.[4]

Glassberger was born at Olmütz in Moravia, and entered the Franciscan Order in 1472, at Amberg (Bavaria), which was then in the Province of Strassburg. In 1475-76, he studied at Basle; after 1479, we find him again at Amberg, and somewhat later at Munich. From 1483 to 1509, Glassberger was a member of the Franciscan House at Nürnberg. Here he labored for some time as preacher and confessor of the Poor Clares. As we find no trace of him after 1509, he is supposed to have died about that time.

It was at Nürnberg that Glassberger wrote his Chronicle: in the years 1506–1509; a circumstance which contributes much to enhance the value of his work. For, as Nürnberg was then the great commercial centre of Southern Germany, the friar had excellent opportunities for ascertaining what was going

[1] *Die Franciscaner in den Vereinigten Staaten Nordamerica's*, Koln, 1892.

[2] *The Missions and Missionaries of California*, Vol. i, San Francisco, 1908.

[3] *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens*, Freiburg, i. B., 1909, pp. 500–501; Latin edition, *Manuale historiae Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, ib., 1909, pp. 450–451.

[4] See *Analecta Franciscana*, ii, Quaracchi, 1887, Preface, and H. BOEHMER, *Chronica Fratris Jordani* (*Collection d'études et de documents*, Vol. vi), Paris, 1908, Introduction, pp. xxv *ff.*

on in the world abroad; all the more so, since being preacher and confessor of the convent of St. Clare, he knew the first families of the town. His Chronicle reflects clearly in some passages this *milieu*. To its influence is certainly due the long text he consecrates to the discovery of the New World, an event which, in the eyes of the zealous friar had perhaps more religious interest than any other, since an immense unlabored field for spreading the Gospel was disclosed, and a new prospect of mission work opened to his Order.

Indeed, the chief interest of Glassberger's account consists in his narrative of the first endeavor made by the Franciscans to convert the inhabitants of the West Indian Islands, while here and there we get a glimpse at the life and customs of the Indians and at the marvelous productions of the soil of the New World.

It appears from the narrative of Glassberger, that the news of the great discovery achieved by Columbus was generally spread amongst the Franciscans of the Observance at their Chapter held in 1493 at Florenzae (France). Immediately many of the friars applied with great eagerness to their Vicar-General, Olivier Maillard, for permission to go to the new missions. The first to obtain the longed-for permission were, strangely enough, two lay brothers, John de la Deule and John Cosin, both belonging to the Province of France. They went to Spain and remained some time there before the opportunity came of sailing for the West Indies; this opportunity being no other than the second expedition of Columbus, which started from Cadix on September 25, 1493, and in which Bernard Boil was also a member. On arriving in the New World the two friars lived with the natives and tried first of all to learn their language and by degrees to instruct the people. They lived thus for five years, and considering the fact that they were not priests, they could not do much towards conversion; so they determined to return to Europe to bring over some Franciscan priests. They took along with them two Indian youths, having the precaution to embark each with one of the Indians on two different ships, in order that, if one should perish, at least the other would survive. On reaching Spain one of the natives became seriously ill and soon died after having been baptized. The two lay brothers considered this the first visible fruit of their long work and buried the poor Indian at the nearest Franciscan convent. They presented themselves to their Superior, Olivier Maillard, who happened to be in Spain, and gave him a full account of their work, at the same time beseeching him to send over some priests. Maillard accordingly settled the matter with the Sovereigns of Spain, and thus towards Easter, 1500, F. John Baudin, a native of Bretagne, with some other Franciscans, sailed for the West, fully equipped with all the requirements of their holy ministry. On August 25, in the same year, a second Franciscan Mission started from Spain and reached in 25 days the harbour of S. Domingo on Hispaniola (Hayti) where they baptized—doubtless after due instruction—some 3,000 natives.

Here Glassberger inserts in his narrative the calumnies against Columbus, which were spread over Europe, after his return from his third expedition. For, no doubt, the *admiraldus* who is mentioned, is none other than the great discoverer, who experienced in so large a measure the ingratitude of this world.

Describing at some length the different islands of the West Indies, the

Chronicler gives us the full text of a letter which the Franciscan Missionaries of Hispaniola (Hayti) wrote on October 12, 1500, to Olivier Maillard, who received it whilst visiting the Saxon Province in 1501, and who left a copy of it (at the request of Glassberger?) in the Franciscan Convent of Nürnberg. The letter itself bears witness to the anxiety of the missionaries to obtain more help for their great work. The whole Order was to be aroused to take interest in the enterprise and to send laborers for the great spiritual harvest.

These are, briefly, the outlines of Glassberger's narrative, which has the great advantage of being a contemporary one and of being fully confirmed and partly completed by other independent early sources. Bartholomew de las Casas,[5] the great benefactor of the Indians, tells us of two Franciscan lay brothers, whom he met at Barcelona, John de la Duela and John de Tisim (evidently the Cosin of Glassberger), natives of Burgundy, fellow-travelers of Bernard Boil, and with whom he became very friendly. Their zeal for the conversion of souls in the New World had brought them to Spain, and although only lay brothers, they were well instructed, and it was clear, says Las Casas, that they had declined the priesthood for humility's sake. From the narrative of Las Casas we can correct the statements of Glassberger, who although generally well informed, was in this case not an eye-witness as Las Casas was. It would appear from Glassberger that the two friars set out to preach to the Moors of Southern Spain and only perchance got a place with Columbus, whilst Las Casas tells us clearly that he met the friars in question at Barcelona, where they had already been engaged for the expedition by Boil. By this it would seem that their staying amongst the Spaniards was due only to the circumstance that they had to wait for Columbus' second expedition to start.

The *Archivo de Indias* at Sevilla[6] has preserved us the names of some of the Franciscans who were sent to America in 1500, by the great Ximenez, Archbishop of Toledo. Amongst them we find Francis Ruyz, the bearer of the letter to Maillard. That missionary was sent back, as the letter says, on account of his weak health. We find also John Deledeulle, our John de la Deule, who in 1500 returned to his beloved mission. His death in the West Indies is recorded in the Chapter of the Observant Franciscans in 1511, as having happened since the last Chapter was held in 1508.

[5] *Historia de las Indias*, lib. i, c. 81, in *Collection de documentos ineditos para la historia de España* por el Marqués De la Fuensanta del Valle y D. Jose Sancho Rayon, Vol. lxii, Madrid, 1875, p. 494. After having said that he could not see Bernard Boil at Barcelona (in 1493) Las Casas continues:

> Pero alcancé á cognoscer dos religiosos de la órden de Sant Francisco, que fueron con él, frailes legos, pero personas notables, naturales de Picardia ó borgoñones, é que se movieron á venir acá por sólo celo de la conversion destas ánimas, y, aunque frailes legos, eran muy bien sabidos y letrados, por lo cual se cognoscia, que por humiltad no quisieron ser sacerdotes; uno de los cuales se llamó fray Juan de la Duela, ó fray Juan el Bermejo, porque lo era, y el otro fray Juan de Tisin. Fueron bien cognoscidos mios, y en amistad y conversacion, al ménos al uno, muy conjuntos.

Jose Coll, O.F.M., who in his work: *Colon y la Habida*, 2 ed. Madrid, 1892, p. 271, has already drawn attention to this text, quotes also p. 270: Juan de Torquemada, O.F.M., *De la Monarquia Indiana*, Madrid, 1723, Vol. iii, lib. xviii, c. 6, who speaks in much the same terms of the two first Franciscan missionaries, the most prominent of which seems to have been John de la Deule; on him see also Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, ad a. 1493, n. 3, ed. 2, Vol. xv, p. 28.

[6] Coll, p. 272. Wadding, ad. a 1511, n. 9 (xv, 431); De Gubernatis, *Orbis seraphicus*, iii, Rome, 1684, p. 220b.

In the meantime, missions and convents had so increased that the first Franciscan Province in America could be erected in 1505 under the title of the Holy Cross. This Province included Hayti, Cuba, Jamaica and the other islands of the Antilles.[7]

The Munich Manuscript, from which we take the narrative of Glassberger, measuring mm. 225 × 156, is written by two hands at the beginning of the XVI century. There are in the MS. 298 numbered folios; in the beginning there are three folios (two wholly, one mostly unwritten) and at the end five (unwritten) folios, which are not counted. Folios 5–9 remain also blank. Folio 192 was counted twice, but the mistake has been corrected by pencil all through the rest of the MS. Most titles and a few initials are written in red; some short annotations are in red or black on the edges of the pages, surrounded by several circles in red or black. The groups of the folios are usually made up of twelve (sexternions), the first six of which being marked in the right corner below with the letters of the alphabet in red, for instance, *a*1, *a*2, etc., till *a*6, the six following folios not being countersigned. This system begins on fol. 8 with *a*1 and ends on fol. 239 with *v*6, hence comprising fol. 240–245 in the system. There are, however, some few instances of traces of letters written in the same manner, but in black, on the following folios; but these marks have either not been regularly written or, more probably, have been cut away at the binding. The binding itself is contemporary to the MS. and consists of wooden boards covered with pigskin with impressed handsome Renaissance ornaments. Two former brass clasps are wanting now.

The text published below is copied from the Munich Manuscript, which has already been printed with the rest of the Chronicle in the *Analecta Franciscana* (Vol. ii, QUARACCHI, 1887, pp. 523–526), where the orthography of the author has been rather modernised. We give the text exactly as it stands in the manuscript, in modern punctuation, and with *u* and *v* as we use them nowadays.

Fr. Nicolaus Glassberger, O. F. M., Chronica, ad a. 1500

Ms. in the Archives of the Franciscan Province of Bavaria, Munich, folio 270v-272r.

[f.270v] Ea tempestate, cum superioribus annis regnante in Hyspania aliisque circumiacentibus regnis Ferdinando katholico, rege, et Elisabeth, eius legittima coniuge, [f.271r] regina, fide christiana ferventissima, quidam mercatores et naute in mari expertissimi, opera et impensa dicti regis insulas quasdam novas maximis periculis, infortunys et impendiis in remotissimis partibus Oceani versus Indianas partes, Deo auspice, reperissent, in quibus gens barbarica, a nostra fide omnino aliena, bestialiter vivens, nudo corpore pecudum more incedens, morabatur. Que res cum Fratribus Ordinis Minorum et Observantie de familia ex Provincia Francie innotuisset, more elephantis ad sanguinis aspectum animati, post capitulum Florentiaci celebratum reverendum patrem fratrem Oliverium Maillardi, Generalem Vicarium, pro impetranda licentia accesserunt, viti utique vita maturi, zelo fidei ferventissimi, patientia probati martirioque apprime flagrantes Fratres. Inter quos erant duo fratres laici, viri corpore robusti, animo devoti et mente ad

[7] WADDING, ad a. 1505, n. 11 (XV, 298).

quecumque obprobria pro Christi nomine perferenda promptissimi, videlicet frater Johannes de la Deule, et frater Johannes Cosin. Hy, obtenta licentia a dicto reverendo patre Vicario Generali, ad partes dictas infidelium ultra regnum Granate perrexerunt in nomine Domini; in quibus tamen partibus propter gentium barbariem infidelium et ignorantiam ydeomatis facere fructum nequibant, quamquam plurima paterentur a Saracenis incommoda in tantum aliquando, ut coacti fame et inedia, serpentes manducarent. Cum autem sine fructu ibidem starent, ad alia loca divertere statuerunt; et ecce, Deo duce, ad novas insulas aspirantes, et ad oras Hispanie applicantes naves illo tendentes reperiunt, in quas naucleri benignitate recepti sunt, eo quod et corpore robusti, religione devoti atque moribus graves videbantur, in quos nec parum aliorum vota aspirabant, utpote qui et corporis valitudine et mentis devotione apud Deum in periculis suffragari possent.

Cumque predicti Fratres sic, ut permittitur, ad dictas insulas pervenissent, nec tamen in aliquo ob linguagii ignorantiam proficerent in populo, nihilominus ad quinquennium inibi persistentes maximis persecutionibus, aliquantulum ad ydiomatis peritiam pervenerunt. Et quia habitus et vestimenta computruerant, unus ex ipsis Fratribus cepit filare lanam bombicem sibique ac socio, ne nudi incederent, tunicas sive vestes aptare. Finito autem quinquennio, cum predicarent populis fidem katholicam, repererunt eos satis voluntarios et aptos. Unde et apud se deliberantes, cum essent laici, ad Hyspaniam pro adducendis sacerdotibus redire disposuerunt cum nautis, duos invenes illius gentis et insule nondum baptisatos secum ducentes. Cumque in duabus navibus separati unusquisque Fraturm unum iuvenem secum haberet, ut si una navis periret, salvaretur altera, ne effectu fraudarentur per equora, aut diversa fortuna, et multis periculis velitantes aliquamdiu, tandem partes fidelium applicuerunt. Unus autem ex iuvenibus illis gravissime cepit infirmari, quem Fratres morti vicinum videntes baptisaverunt in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti etc., [f. 271v] et tandem mortuum in dorso et brachys ad viciniorem Fratrum conventum deportantes, solemniter novum Christianum quasi laborum suorum primitias sepulture tradiderunt, alio reservato.

Cum autem dictum reverendum patrem Oliverium in Hyspanie partibus reperissent, accedentes cum narraverunt, que viderant mirabilia in mari et insulis, humili instantia eidem supplicantes, ut sacerdotes ad insulas destinaret. Ille autem reverendus Pater, cum rem ipsam regi Hyspanie regineque insinuasset, idem rex, gaudio repletus, cum sua inclita consorte navem cum necessarys aptantes, quamplura clenodia pro divino cultu, videlicet cruces, monstrantias aureas et argenteas, calices, casulas et ornamenta imponentes cum variis tabulis et picturis hystoriarum et gestorum Salvatoris, quibus gens tam effera ad pietatem duceretur.

Quo audito, multi Fratres ad dictum reverendum patrem Oliverium accedentes, illuc mitti se postularunt, viri maturi, martirio flagrantes, et complures aly ab ipsis excitati. Quorum zelum et fervorem dictus reverendus Pater considerans et iuxta regularia instituta eos de vita et constantia fidei examinans, eorum petitioni condescendit.

Anno igitur currente millesimo quingestesimo circa medium Quadragesime sese preparantes, tandem sabbato ante dominicam Palmarum Fratres devoti: Iohannes Baudin de Britania cum duobus aliis singularis devotionis, nec non aliis comitantibus, navim conscendentes, cum nautis per longos maris tractus

ad supradictas insulas venerunt, omnem operam et diligentiam adhibentes ad dominicam voluntatem adimplendam, ut gens illa barbara fidei rudimenta reciperet. Exponentibus autem militibus de thesauris regis et regine pro divino cultu et ornamentis, plurimum ducebantur illi homines in admirationem et stuporem et cum gaudio volabant ad bapismum, collaudantes Deum.

Preterea, eodem anno, XXV, die Augusti, exierunt aliqui Fratres sancti Francisci, divino amore ferventes, in insulam Chades, insulam Hyspanie circa strictum Sibillie, non longe a columpnis Herculis, in XXIX diebus venrunt ad insulam Hyspanam. Et dum applicarent naves Hyspanie ad quendam portum, quen iam nominant portum *sancti Dominici* a nauclero, qui dicebatur Dominicus, baptisata sunt tria milia hominum. Speratur autem, in brevi multas alias insulas magnas sacrum baptisma suscepturas. Amiraldus autem quidam capitaneus et prior inibi positus, male tractans homines istos novos bona eorum et uxores aufferendo et filias virgines stuprando, accusatus, ab officio depositus, chatenis et loris ferreisque compedibus alligatus, in Hyspaniam reducitur, alio in eius locum subrogato.

Sunt et alie insule sic ab Hyspanis nominate. Prima dicitur insul Dei, quia Dei providentia et solo eius nutu inventa est; 2ª insula Ferdinandi, a rege Hyspanie; 3ª insula Elisabethina, a regina Hyspanie; 4ta Hyspana; 5ta Hyspaniola. Sunt autem homines inibi commorantes natura liberales, simplices et pii, sed magni zelotipi, vivuntque de panibus, confectis ex radicibus odoris et saporis pastinace, [f.271r] vulgariete *Gelb Ruben*[1]; similiter et ex sorgo, quod est species milii. Et insule sunt fertilissime, carentes tamen omni animali quadrupede preter cuniculos. Adducta sunt ex Hyspania multa paria animalium, que inibi miro modo prolificant, precipue porci. Item, adducte sunt vites, que eodem anno botros protulerunt, similiter frumentum et legumina. Ceterum nullam habent legem nec libros nec litteras, ignorantes, quomodo illuc devenerint, nec putabant, alios homines vivere super terram. Credebant post hanc vitam aliam, in qua melius haberent nescientes tamen, a quo et ubi. Lanam arboribus procreatam in copia habent et tamen ab antea nudi incedebant; ex qua lana quidam Frater compulsus, filando ipsam, sibi et confratri suo habitum fecit. Habent in Augusto diem longissimum XVIII horarum, alias dies anni equals sunt, nisi forte ad duas horas; suntque homines illi coloris citrini ad modum foliorum de arboribus cadentium. Ex insula autem Hyspaniola miserunt Fratres litteras reverendo patri fratri Oliverio, Generali Vicario, qui eos destinaverat, quas anno Domini 1501 in Provincia Saxonie recepit, exemplar nobis in conventu Nürenbergensi relinquens subsequentis tenoris:

Reverendissimo ac dignissimo in Christo patri fratri Oliverio Maillardi, Vicario Generali cismontano Ordinis beati Patris nostri Francisci etc.

Reverendissime atque dignissime Pater et domine. Vestram Paternitatem facio certiorem, quantam nobis Dominus contulerit misericordiam, quia ipse, qui olim Patribus nostris per mare rubrum dux exstitit, etiam nos indignos dignatus est incolumes concedere, ad istas insulas pervenire, in quibus tanta invenitur animarum multitudo, quod est mirabile dictu. Sed mirabilius, quod omnes sine contradictione aliqua et cum maximo affectu Domini appetunt baptismum. Unde bene potest verificari illud Salvatoris nostri in Evangelio: *Messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci.* Pauco tempore, videlicet dum

[1] German term for carrots.

starent naves in portu, tria milia animarum receperunt fidem Christi. Quamobrem multum gaudere debes de prole Christi multiplicata, maxime per ministerium filiorum tuorum. Sed quia non te fugit, mi colendissime Pater, istam esse professionem nostram, fidem Christi in nobis et in proximis nostris, divina adiuvante gratia Christi, multiplicare; ideo rogo Paternitatem tuam ob amorem Ihesu Christi, ut ista predices et manifestes filys atque subditis tuis, utomnes, quibus Dominus animarum suarum zelum infuderit, qui velint crucem Christi suaque vestigia sequi et ad insulas istas venire, eos benigno favore prosequaris. Insuper, in capitulo generali coram patribus hoc insinuans, ut omnes simul conformiter sine Prelatorum perturbatione et scandalo aliqui Fratres per omnes Provincias et Custodias ad hoc assignentur et cum benedictione Dei totiusque capituli ad partes istas mitantur. Et quia frater Franciscus Ruyz, qui propter suam debilem complexionem, et ut adiuvet nos coram Domino Archipeiscopo et suis regalibus maiestatibus, ad Hyspaniam mittitur, longiorem faciet vestre Paternitati relationem de omnibus. Valeat et oret pro me et suis filiis, qui mecum sunt, qui plurimas tibi mittunt salutes et tuam humiliter postulant benedictionem.

Datum in insula, Hyspaniola nuncupata, 12 die Octobris, anno 1500.

DOCUMENTS

SOME LETTERS OF FATHERS BADIN AND NERINCKX TO BISHOP CARROLL

The following documents are printed from photostat copies of originals in the Archdiocesan Archives, Baltimore. They all have a direct bearing on the historic misunderstanding between Revs. Stephen T. Badin and Charles Nerinckx, two pioneer missionaries of Kentucky, and the early Dominicans in that state, and throw much light on the article which this issue of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW (pp. 15-45) presents to its readers on that subject. They certainly give the question a phase quite different from that to which the American public has long been accustomed. Many letters of a similar character on the same topic might be reproduced, but the fact that they contain much litigious, disagreeable or other matter wholly foreign to the point at issue, determined us to limit ourselves to the publication of those that follow. The first two, as will be noticed, are from the pen of Father Badin, and cannot be overlooked by those desirous of knowing the real origin of the unpleasantness. The others were written by that missionary's friend and companion, Father Nerinckx. For the sake of correct history and illumination, notes and comments will be made on them as they appear in their proper order.

Father Badin's Reception of Rev. E. D. Fenwick on the Occasion of the Latter's Visit to Kentucky in the Spring of 1805

For the historical setting of the following document in the unpleasantness referred to above, the reader is referred to the article (pp. 15-45). Suffice it here to state that the letter reveals a heart filled with gratitude and joy at the prospects held out to the Church in Kentucky by the coming of the Dominicans.

Near Bardstown, 15th May, 1805.

Most Reverend Sir:

I have the happiness this day of enjoying the company of the Revd. Mr. Fenwick which you had announced in former letters, intimating as soon as he arrived in America that, as Kentucky was likely to be a center from which true Religion would be disseminated in the western countries, you would engage him to turn his views towards our desolate congregations so needful and capable of cultivation. I never doubted of your sincere wish to procure for us spiritual assistance, which indeed was not to be obtained in your Diocese without your direction or concurrence. Many are the tokens of your goodness towards me and my numerous congregations, and I have now to return my heartfelt thanks for making Kentucky the first object of your pastoral solicitude upon the arrival of St. Dominic's family. Flattering myself that I seconded your views, knowing the scarcity of Priests in your immense diocese, fully sensible of the difficulty and almost impossibility to replace clergymen as they depart from life or from duty, impressed also with the idea confirmed by former experience that much less good is done by individual clergymen, isolated as they are or unconnected with a regular

body acting uniformily by the same principles of obedience, disinterestedness and zeal, seeing how the missionaries along the Mississippi have already abandoned their numerous flocks to follow the Spanish government, apprehensive also that the service of Alm. God and the salvation of souls cannot be *permanently* secured to this and the neighboring countries but by the exertions of a regular body of pious and enlightened men, who shall not fail of success, when established under the Blessing of heaven in a country where there are no prejudices of the civil constitution to oppose their humane and religious views; evidencing every day the alarming progress of infidelity and vice which threatens us with an almost universal deluge, unless our youth be regenerated and properly educated; actuated by these and other congenial motives, I have made a proposal to Mr. Fenwick which is submitted to your Reverence, and which I earnestly request you to sanction. I have begged this gentleman to exonerate me of the trouble of holding so much ecclesiastical property which in my opinion will do much more good to my fellow-creatures, when vested in the order of St. Dominic, under your episcopal jurisdiction. Wherefore I hope you will grant me the favour or leave of transferring to that religious order the Ecclesiastical property now in my hands, to which I have added 220 acres of my own land, the whole containing upwards of 100 acres of cleared ground, with other convenient improvements. By these means may be immediately started the intended plan of an Academy with a moderate assistance from the Catholics of this State who will undoubtedly join their cordial endeavours to procure their own happiness, that of their children and their children's posterity. I had conceived for these ten years past the desire of seeing in Kentucky such an establishment arise, the which appeared to me almost a chimera, since I saw then neither temporal means for a foundation, nor any probable hope of having the cooperation of such men as would be calculated to answer so useful designs. But how limited are the views of men! and how evident that the Divine Providence over the church is *attingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter disponens omnia suaviter!*

As Mr. Fenwick and his brethren will assume the obligation of fulfilling the duties of the mission as well as myself, and it is important that the missionaries of the country should as much as possible be directed by the same spirit, I do humbly request and confidently hope that you will give me leave to be associated to St. Dominic's family. I conceived that wish as well as the other resolution within two day[s] after Mr. Fenwick's arrival and have never varied.

Should I have been unwilling to apply to its intended use the property trusted by Providence as a depositum in my hands, I would esteem myself accountable for the good not done, which will be otherwise done to my Parishioners and other denominations, and for the evil which might have been prevented and I hope shall be prevented by the instrumentality of Mr. Fenwick and his brethren.

Craving your Episcopal Benediction, I have the honour to be very respectfully,

Most reverend Sir,

Your obedt. Son in Xt,

STEPHEN THEODORE BADIN.[1]

[1] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 1, G 9.—Although it is somewhat French in its phraseology, there can be no doubt about the meaning of this straightforward letter, or the impression made on Father Badin by the humble Dominican.

Father Badin's Change of Mind

The reader is again referred to the article (p. 19), for the place which the following document occupies in the controversy. But he must not lose sight of the fact that meanwhile Father Badin had seen no Dominican. Father Fenwick returned to Maryland, with the above letter, and wrote to Rev. R. L. Concanen, as has been stated in the article, telling him of the prospects held out for his pious enterprise in Kentucky, and of Badin's proposals which, he says, Bishop Carroll "applauds and consents to." That the friar also sent Father Badin a similar message, and that Doctor Carroll wrote to the same missionary advising at least such an arrangement for the good of religion in the new west, the document which we now lay before the reader leaves no room for doubt.

The church lands in Kentucky at this time consisted of several hundred acres, mostly covered with forests and of little value. There were also two small log presbyteries. Besides these, Father Badin had a residence of the same character, known as Saint Stephen's. Doubtless the friar hoped to see the day when the land would be brought under cultivation, and used for the same good purposes to which he had seen similar property devoted in his native Maryland. The little rectories would give shelter to the missionaries and perhaps eventually become centers of extensive spiritual activities. However, when he learned that these possessions were not to be his, he bore the dissappointment with that spirit of Christian resignation which characterized his whole life.

The reader, we venture to think, can hardly fail to notice how grotesque, inconsistent and preposterous this document really is. Such, however, are most of Father Badin's letters in which he tries to extricate himself from a difficulty. In spite of all his subterfuge, we fancy that those who read the document with care will have great difficulty in convincing themselves that he had only a few talks with Father Nerinckx on the subject in question, or that the Belgian clergyman was not the inspiration of practically all that it contains.

Near Bardstown 5th 8ber 1805.

Most Reverend Father in God

I am just returning from Madison Cty and avail myself of an hour of leisure to answer your favors of May 29 and Aug. 12. The last being an answer to my letter sent in May; since which epoch I have not had the honour of writing to your Reverence, both for want of leisure or opportunity and of your last favour which Mr. Fenwick made me expect shortly after his return to Maryland. Indeed the principal subject of our present correspondence is so weighty that it needed time to meditate on it, especially as my venerable companion Mr. Nerinckx seems to be reluctant to give his opinion; and his zeal in the mission forbids frequent communications: for these four or five weeks we have had but very few interviews, although our lodgings be under the same roof.[1] His constitution must be uncommonly robust to do so much business as he does, and I am apprehensive his example may possibly prove detrimental to my

[1] This certainly proves the truth of Fenwick's statement to Concanen that Bishop Carroll "warmly applauds and consents to" the two proposals contained in Badin's previous letter. However, the prelate evidently left the final decision of the matter to Fathers Badin and Nerinckx, the latter of whom had started from Georgetown College for Kentucky before Fenwick returned to Maryland.

health, as I am ashamed to be so far behind him. I return heartfelt thanks to Divine Providence for having procured us a Priest who is *in omni sensu* what a vicar of Christ ought to be; and who, if he lives long enough, will operate wonders here. I cannot express the happiness I enjoy in him; it is only allayed by the fear that I have of seeing in Kentucky Priests who would not be capable of imitating his zeal and disinterestedness, the plainness of his manners, his rigid sobriety, &c. &c. which are all necessary in a country situated as this is; where so many scandals have been given in the infancy of the church, and where so much good is to be done at a time when men seem to arise from a Lethargy, and express their amazement at the (dying) follies which have taken place for these three years past among various Religionists, who are ending now or sinking into Socinianism or Scepticism. Twelve Apostles of the venerable Mr. Nerinckx's disposition would make most of the western countries embrace the true faith.

Seeing the necessity in which we are of missionaries, I was willing to make the sacrifice of my all, to procure them and assure a permanency and succession of faithful ministers, raised in the very country where they are to exercise the sacred functions: But since I have made my proposals to Mr. Fenwick, I have evidently seen that not only it would not be advantageous, but it might prove very detrimental to Religion to surrender the whole Ecclesiastical property to one Order, exclusively, which in time will probably claim, besides, privileges and exemptions from the jurisdiction and control of the Ordinary. I shall not comment on the many and valuable reasons your Reverence has adduced in your last.[3] I really thought that Mr. F. at the very time I was writing my proposals was, with modesty, however, showing a grasping disposition: for he was not satisfied with one only of the church livings; but as two days before I had show'd a cheerful disposition to part with everything to establish the Order, he insisted on possessing everything: Knowing and expressly mentioning that such a disposition should be submitted to your corrective, I acquiesced although but little edified. This and other traits of character seem to confirm your observation that it is but too common among Religious to think that the splendor of their Order is the greatest benefit to religion.[4] I have noticed and reflected on whatever passed between Mr. F. and me, and plainly saw that he had a great partiality to Maryland, which I was determined to counteract, according to your wishes; at our first interview in Scott Cty he expressly said within a very few minutes that he was pretty indifferent about Kentucky, and that unless better offers were made here to him than he had received in Maryland where he had very flattering prospects, he could not think of settling in our State; and that he had undertaken his journey rather in compliance to the request of your Reverence. The possession of the church in Scott Cty did not excite at all his ambition. Finally both he and his brother-in-law appeared to be in a great hurry to return home.

[3] This also shows that Bishop Carroll advised giving the church lands in Kentucky to the friars Yet he waited to hear Father Nerinckx's wishes in the affair before making the transfer. So also it may be remarked here that Fenwick's character is so opposed to what is said about him in the rest of this document, that those who have studied the man will be compelled to believe Father Badin drew generously on his fertile French imagination. A number of his letters show him to have done this at times. Here the change is so sudden and the inconsistency so patent that the influence behind it all cannot be concealed.

[4] Father Badin must have misread Doctor Carroll's letter. The rest of the document, the fact that the bishop himself was a religious and his high regard for Fenwick would indicate this at least.

Being unable to obtain from him the least assistance in the mission of Scott Cty, he was at my house four or five days in my absence, and on my return home, I found them in the disposition of going back the next day to Maryland, without exploring any more of the Country, expecially the extensive tracts on Green river, where a new settlement might be made for the poor Catholics who have no land or have had land or are narrowly settled in Washington and Nelson Counties. I had even the obligation of Mr. Davis for 300 acres of good land for an Ecclesiastical settlement. I represented the distress of the poor Catholics who daily importune me for that object, I insisted on Mr. F. travelling in the limitroph[5] counties, I offered my company: but they appeared so unwilling, especially Mr. Young whom Mr. F. was not likely to disoblige, that my project vanished: I was still more unwilling that Mr. F. should return to Maryland without encouragement; I knew too well that the clergy were not very ready to visit Kentucky, and I feared they would or might receive additional prejudices which would render our present condition still worse. The delays of Mr. Nerinckx, in coming to Kentucky, which I could not account for, since he might have come with Mr. F. who passed by George T. College on his way; the wish of your Reverence that Mr. F. should establish his Academy in Kentucky; the parsimony of the Catholics in general, some of whom had circulated that I countereacted the will of Priests destined for Kentucky lest my (poor) salary should be diminished; in fine everything made me too willing to give. I flattered myself, considering the want of liberality and justice in the people and too often of disinterestedness in clergymen, that the same persons might be both professors and missioners, that the Academy would supply what would be wanting to maintain the church; and in fine that men who have made a vow of poverty and would lead a temperate laborious life would not make so much expence in a monastery nor need so great salaries, as those who are not restricted by vows and have separate livings. I supposed men to be what they should be, and what yourself trusted the Dominicans of Bornheim are. My own reflections on what I have witnessed myself, and other subsequent information which I have all reason to believe correct, give me too much cause to apprehend that illusion is possible respecting the obligation of the vow of poverty.[6]—I have considered what might be the probable utility in Kentucky for our poor Catholics of a college where $100 should be paid for board and tuition. I find on a serious reflection that not half a dozen Catholic parents are able to afford so expensive an education to their children, that consequently the labours of Mr. F. and his four companions would be almost entirely applied to the benefit of other denominations, without much service being rendered to the missions which are so extensive and numerous;[7] that it could not be expected that more than one congreg. and the college could be attended to by the body of the Dominicans. On the other hand we could hardly find secular clergymen willing to become tenants under the control of a regular Order, and consequently the missions would not be sufficiently attended to nor extended and I might have the affliction of incurring censure from the Catholics who have subscribed a considerable sum for the erection of the Dominican college, in hope that they will be able to afford to their children a liberal education for a trifling

[5] Limitrophe, a French word for *neighboring*.

[6] All this is evidently the inspiration of Father Nerinckx.

[7] Yet the college was most beneficial to the Catholics, many of whom received their education practically gratis.

consideration. On this occasion I must observe that the institution of Père Urbain is more likely to answer their expectation, because less expensive.

However as there is a prospect of great services, of edification, of respectability to Religion being procured by the Order; I am ready to comply with your direction and invest Mr. F. and Brethren, in such manner as you will point out, with one seat of land viz. that contiguous to Cartwright's Creek chapel. The land is much better than that I live on. It consists of 112 acres to which I have some prospect of adding the adjacent plantation consisting of 80 acres with good buildings, and orchard.[8] I think the land near Bardstown should be reserved for a Bishop who probably will have a living also (36 acres) in the suburbs of the Town, having received an assurance from a Catholic without heirs that such was his intention. According to the will of Mr. Fournier, I have put Mr. Nerinckx in possession of the plantation on the Rolling Fork. A Priest is much wanting in Scott Cty, Lexington and Mason Cty; I hope that some virtuous friends of Mr. Nerinckx will soon come, as he expects. A Priest also should be settled in Danville who should attend the Congreg. in Madison, and make excursions about the country. Two months ago I visited two new settlements in Shelby Cty one of which is likely to become considerable. It is about 40 miles n. e. from my residence. Two Priests are wanting about Bardstown, one for Coxe's Creek, Shelby and Jefferson Cties; the other for Bardstown, Poplar neck and Hardin Cty. There are several families where they might be accommodated. I should also have a Priest constantly with me for Pottinger's Creek alone; and after much labour, much will remain undone. I receive frequent communications from St. Vincent (Indiana). The people there appear to be in great distress for want of a pastor, and there is a great harvest to make. Mr. Nerinckx will no doubt inform you of the Catholics in Ohio State.[9]

Bardstown, 12, 8*ber* 1805.

Most Reverend Father in God

Since I wrote the above, I have had one only interview with Mr. Nerinckx, for the space of half an hour, on the subject of the transfer of the Ecclesiastical property to Mr. Fenwick, &c., although he was unwilling to give his opinion, an ominous circumstance; at length, seeing the business coming to a crisis, he expressed himself fully.[10] He thinks that such a thing is contrary to the Canons of the Church, that it is a subtraction of Ecclesiastical property, not an addition of means intended immediately for the good of souls. Indeed the Dominicans would be made independent of the Episcopal authority, if they were possessors of the whole Ecclesiastical property; and the Bishop, who is by the nature of his office the Governor of the Church, must be governed by those under his jurisdiction, and seeds of schism would be sow'd,[11] as is this day exemplified at N. Orleans. For let us suppose that the Dominicans or any

[8] This shows how it happened that Saint Ann's Church passed to the charge of the Dominicans. However, they did not get the land, although it was given, largely at least, by the people for the use of the priest who should serve them.

[9] Likely Jacob Dittoe had written of the spiritually destitute condition of the few Catholics in central Ohio. But Father Nerinckx never, as far as we have been able to discover, visited that state.

[10] This is another proof that Bishop Carroll himself sanctioned and advised the transfer of the ecclesiastical property to the Dominicans. We recur to this so often because we have heard a person maintain that this letter shows the venerable prelate demurred to Father Badin's proposal.

[11] This letter is published in the *Records* of the *American Catholic Historical Society*, xxiii, 166*ff*. But the part from this comma to the end of the next paragraph is omitted.

other Order should be possessed of the whole Ecclesiastical property; let us further suppose that error or heresy, or any substantial deviation from morals or discipline should take place in individuals or in the body; let us suppose that the Bishop of course should attempt to suspend the delinquents; in that case they will submit or they will not: if they submit, still they retain possession of the temporal property of the church, although they are incapacitated to serve it, and the congreg. must find an adequate salary for a successor: but if they submit not, the which they will probably be inclined to considering their independence otherwise, we have a schism; and the Parishioners who see the schismatic perform the same rites of the church as the genuine Pastors do (this was lately the case in France &c.), and who are not generally speaking capable of Theological discussions, or rather are prepossessed in favor of the clergyman enjoying temporal independence, and who needs or will require no salary to propagate his independence among his adherents; the Parishioners, I say, will naturally prefer such a man, whose practice cannot be rigid, to the true Pastor who has come in the Sheepfold by the door, not as the thief &c., but must receive a proper salary.[12]

These reflections may be deduced from the Bull of Pius VI of Pious memory for the erection of the See of Baltimore, intrusting the Bishop with the management of the Ecclesiastical property; and accordingly I did in my Testament will that now in my hands both to Your Reverance and R. R. Coadjutor, jointly and separately.

Mr. Nerinckx expresses no little surprise at the ambition of the Dominicans of Bornheim, who hold now the property of that foundation which is worth 100,000 crowns and in better times would fetch what it is worth, without mentioning the other resources of Mr. Fenwick.[13]

In fine Mr. Nerinckx, whose Charity hindered the manifestation of his opinion, until necessity urged him, does strongly suspect the purity of their faith who, when clerymen in the low countries were under violent persecution, could be with impunity strolling in the country and in the streets, and amidst the lawless soldiery of the French revolution: Their having redeemed the Bornheim property confirms his suspicions.[14] A letter does not admit of lengthy details; only he is so much disheartened at the thought of becoming partaker with them in the sacred ministry that he spoke with resolution of his leaving the State if the Dominicans trouble themselves otherwise than with a college.[15] This thing I the more heartily deprecate, as his disinterestedness is quite Apostolical, a thing little to be expected in our days; and he looks for some respectable friends, who have been tried in the crucible, and have powerful protectors in Europe, able and willing to support the Missions where they will establish themselves; and in fact Mr. Nerinckx has already received several remittances which prove that this is not an ideal scheme. I speak confidentially, because I repose myself entirely on the experience

[12] This bit of curious English and Jansenistic and Gallican canon law, omitted in the *Records*, etc., must have provoked Bishop Carroll to a smile.

[13] The property at Bornheim belonged to the Dominicans in England, not to those in America. Just at that time, the house could have been bought for 25,000 florins. So, too, were Fenwick's resources practically consumed by the purchase of Saint Rose Farm.

[14] For this matter see article, pp. 32-33.

[15] Father Badin is afraid that the Dominicans will not labor on the missions. Father Nerinckx says that if they do, he will leave Kentucky. This looks like the friars were "between the devil and the deep blue sea."

and wisdom of your Reverence. Mr. Nerinckx observes also in addition to the above that monks are but auxiliaries, that they have but a delegated jurisdiction, that they enjoy the ordinary only in becoming Bishops, and that the reverse must be the case, if invested with the whole Ecclesiastical property, and armed besides with immunities, privileges and exemptions from the ordinary.[16] I shall add only that Religious communities which have appeared to Catholic Governments so formidable or useless that their property has been unjustly made national, may at a future time become in this *infidel* country exceptionable also, especially if in the course of things feuds, envy, scandals, independence or rivalities were to take place, the which we have but too much reason to apprehend, considering the nature of man. If I be well informed the Legislature of Virginia has already made an havoc among the Episcopalians, a body which appeared to them too wealthy and perhaps formidable: The same alarm might possibly at a future time be raised in this country, where we have already the Trapists [*sic*], probably the Dominicans, and possibly the Franciscans, friends to the Revd Mr. Eagan, as mentioned in your letter of May.[17]—To conclude, as there are particular graces for every vocation, and the merciful Providence of God has placed you to rule his church, I shall trouble myself with nothing else but to follow your orders.

I shall briefly advert to other subjects. Fathers Basil and Dominic, Trappists, died at my house two weeks after their arrival in Kentucky; F. Urban has received the Viaticum several times and is now in a poor situation as I am informed. The two thirds of the community have been very sick from the fatigues of the journey. . . .[18] I sincerely rejoice at the restoration of the Jesuits and hope their services will again be felt in America more extensively: they have some enlightened friends in the Government of this State.—As to Mr. Stoddart's land, it might be expedient to receive for church purposes a small tract *unconditionally*, say 500 acres for the maintenance of a Bishop. I shall probably take a ride there with Col. Edwards (once of Maryland) to explore that country, but 30 or 40 miles from this.—Mrs. Abell has not become Catholic and may not become such for several years to come.—We have not as yet published the Jubilee.—I have published lately the *real principles of Catholics*, of which I shall send your Reverence a copy by the first opportunity. I have six dollars in my hands for your Cathedral.

I have the honour to be very respectfully, craving your Episcopal benediction, Most Reverend Father in God,

Your very hble Servant and obedt Son in Xt.

S. T. Badin.

P. S. I have thought proper to inclose my letter to Mr. Fenwick for your Reverence's inspection, which you will be good enough to seal and send, if you think it answers the purpose.[19]

---

[16] This speaks for itself. But we submit that Father Nerinckx should not have let his desire to establish a Belgian mission in Kentucky, a laudable ambition though it was, carry him to such extremes against the Dominicans sent there by the bishop.

[17] What a change from Badin's previous letter!

[18] The matter omitted here is of a delicate personal nature, and has no bearing on any Dominican or on our subject.

[19] Father Badin's letter is in Case 1, G 10 and 11, of the Baltimore Archives. Evidently the one who indexed these archives was led, by its double date, to think that there were two letters. We do not know whether Bishop Carroll gave Fenwick the letter enclosed for him; but it is probable that he did not.

Father Nerinckx's First Letter to Bishop Carroll Touching on the Dominicans

It has been told in the article how Bishop Carroll did not acknowledge the receipt of the above letter from Father Badin, but took advantage of a later one to defend the friars; and the reader has doubtless noticed how Father Badin insinuates, in the document just given, that Father Nerinckx would wish to make at least a part of Kentucky a mission under the care of Belgian priests. Indeed, Father Nerinckx's heart was set on this project. He refers to it in a number of his letters. It was a laudable ambition; but the good priest should not have suffered himself to become so embittered against the Dominicans because their presence was an obstacle to his plan. Like himself, they were sent to Kentucky by the bishop. Yet, although he had signified his intention of leaving the state, unless they confined their labors to the proposed college, hardly had the first two sent west, Wilson and Tuite, reached their destination, when he begins to write, belittling not only their zeal, but that of those who were still to come. Both this project of a Belgian mission and this spirit of disparagement may be seen in the following letter to Bishop Carroll.

J. M. J.

Illme.

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine!

Fasciculum litterarum vobis tradendum curo benevolentia vestra fretus, in finem eum destinandi Rdo Dno Brosius, quem quaeso, ne gravetur ipsas in Europan transferendas tradere, salva enim fuit prima litterarum missio, quam ipse curavit; plurimum illi debitor sum; Deus remunerator sit ejus! ac in grati erga eum animi testimonium sincerissima mea vota pro illius illiusque familiae dilectae et valetudine et salute dignetur accipere. Unum petere mihi liceat ac requirere ab illustriss. Dntne Vtra, ut scilicet non gravetur vel paucissima verba addere litteris meis ad Dm De Wolf Antverpiam; magnum enim hinc litteris meis pondus accedet et fides, in subsidium Americanae missionis et viros et ornamenta et nummos postulantibus.

RR. PP. Dominicani bini jam dudum in hanc regionem advenerunt, coeperuntque aliquamdam Religionis rei operam navare, ut egestate spirituali pressis imo deficientibus succurrant; ast ut apparet, modicae durationis erit eorum adjutorium, cum ex repetitis eorum assertionibus constet illos non ad missionum suppetias sed ad ordinis sui propagationem exiisse, quamquam tamen dicant se quod poterunt facturos in monasterii sui vicinia;[30]; argumentum itaque certissimum incongrue ipsis bona Missionis aut titularium Ecclesiarum fore concedenda, ac spes insuper infirma valde colendi hujus Evangelici agri, ubi sentibus et tribulis spinisque plena omnia, quae semen quodvis suffocant, vix una alterave manu ad resecandum occupari valente; desiderium ergo manifestare cogor habendi in hac regione R. Dm De Cuyper nostratem et si qui sunt alii (:non est tamen hic Dominus singulariter mihi notus:) qui huc accurrere vellent; res sane urget; nam est hic videre miseriam. Porro si fas mihi est mea sensa promere, vereor non expedire nostrates in longe dissita a se loca mittere, quia adventantes novi, plane peregrini nec

[30] Wilson and Tuite, the two fathers then in Kentucky, were specially intended for the novitiate and college which the friars proposed opening. In view of Fenwick's oft-expressed intention, it is safe to say that this, and this only, was what they told Father Nerinckx.

quo se recipiant, cum advenerint, commode invenient, nec cum laborando defecerint seniore aut morbo languerint, ubi mortem praestolentur felicem, ut apud suos facile reperient; ad hoc quae ex patria nostra forte possent subsidia expectari in unam aptius regionem quam in dissitas a se mitterentur, sic ut horum concessa veritate unicum fere videatur superesse, delectus sciliciet istiusmodi regionis; quae autem praeferenda sit, notissima Illustrissmae Dnatnis Vtrae sagaxque prudentia pro gloria Dei determinare dignabitur; omnia, apprime nosco, loca in universa vestra Dioecesi vehementissime desiderant operarios, sed vix credo fieri posse, ut major inveniatur penuria, quam hac in parte, ubi mea quidem opinione fructus sat uber, tardus licet, insuper datur sperari; nolim tamen cuiquam importunus nimis persuasor esse, ut huc advolet, nisi solo Dei zelo et proximi charitate ferveat, solum quae Christi sunt quaerens, certus, quod quae sua sunt, non sit inventurus, atque hisce tantum sub promissis volentem omnem huc amantissime invito.

Non possum non repetere ardentissima mea vota, ut cum operariis aliis Episcopus unus adveniat, non qui videat semel gregem transiens, sed qui visitet semper illi cohabitans vir omni exceptione major, cui committatur grex, ipse fere miseria miserior.

Casuum duorum in causa matrimoniali statum ad Illustrissm Dnatm Vtram transmisi, qui quaeso ne oblivioni trandantur. Litteras quoque cambiales 100 Dalerorum recipiendorum per Illtm Dm Vtram per virum in George-town itinerantem misi, ex quibus 90 designaveram pro tribus campanis in turribus appendendis, quae si emptae sint bonum est; quae si non sint, optarem unam tantum emi valoris ut in praecedentibus notavi, ac de reliquis nummis coemantur libri precum, piarum instructionum ac catechismi & notato in charta quadam eorum pretio, plurimum enim hic libri desiderantur; inter illos optarem aliquoties invenire libellum, cui titulus *Fifty Reasons*. Hoc negotium forte R. Ds Brosius non dedignabitur cordi habere, ut autem huc adferantur opportunitas, puto, proxime aderit, cum multos audiam huc transire paratos. Coeterum paternae vestrae solicitudini quam possum

Commendatissimus tota observantia signor
Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine
Humillimus obseqtissque
vester servus

C. Nerinckx,
pbr.
6 febr, 1806
Holy Mary's at the Rolling F.[21]

P. S. Multum salvere opto R. D. Beeston. Oro placeat inclusas pro R. D. De Bart destinandas ipsi curare.

The following document shows its writer to have been a master of bitter invective. It almost staggers belief that a pious and humble man could employ such violent language. If his ministrations among the people were anything like as harsh as the way in which he speaks of them here, they could not have been otherwise than unpopular with many. Few, we think, will be found who will accept Father Nerinckx's characterization of the early Catholics of Kentucky, nearly all from the old Maryland colony, or born in Kentucky of Mary-

[21] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 2.

land parents. For the answer to his charges against the Dominicans, for the sake of brevity, we must refer the reader to the article of which we have spoken (pp. 15–45). Suffice it here to say that Father Nerinckx, through the arrangement of Father Badin or Bishop Carroll, had now lost, or was on the point of losing, Saint Ann's, his favorite mission. There he contemplated building a brick church which would be the first in Kentucky; but this parish was soon to be given to the Dominicans, if it had not already passed under their care. Doubtless this was as fuel added to the fire. Nor should it be forgotten in this connection that the gloomy, rigorist principles with which Fathers Nerinckx and Badin were deeply imbued, also had their part in the inspiration of these ugly letters against the friars, whose teachings and ministrations were not only milder, but more Catholic. This brought the people to the Dominicans from far and wide, which was more than the other two good missionaries could hear with equanimity. But for further information on this point see article.

J.M.J. 2 *Junii* 1806.

Illustr *Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine.*

Gratissimas vestras, Illust^me^ Dñe, nec minus desideratas recepi salvas; plurimum me confuderunt expressa in iis benevolentiae in me sensa, quibus qualiter respondeam non invenio.

Rvdum De Cuyper et mihi et populo huic ereptum summopere dolui, ob hoc maxime, quod casus hic sit nostrates alios a capessendo itinere absterriturus, et, circumstantiis quibusdam praeter haec attentis, videatur praesagire frustra fieri tentamina ad Missionem quamdam Belgarum, quam quidem ordiri tam fatuus non praesumerem, sed adventantibus ad hoc a Deo viris esse a servitio, quantum mediocritas mea fert, peroptarem; ast Dominus est, quod bonum est faciat.

Ut ordine pergratis vestris respondendo prosequar, pauca de desiderato hic Episcopo tangere nunc occurrit: doleo simulque horreo, tantae rei tantillum me sive in modico sive in magno ad arbitrium compelli, pietati tamen ac observantiae in patrem judicans cedendum, quod Dominus voluerit suggerere exponam, cujus maxime causa agitur; parcat, quaeso, Deus optimus miseriae meae! Condonetque Illustris. Dñatio Vtra adolescentulo et contempto, qui de seniore sensa edere cogor! Addecet sane, ut, si fieri potest, vir eligatur et regionis et morum populi gnarus, qualem, in superioribus vestris memoratum Rvdum D^m^, judicio quoque meo designasti; scientia ejus in utrisque litteris, si ipse judicio quid valeo, apparet mihi supra mediocrem, quae si per tempus et negotia liceret, fusior haud dubie ac magis profunda esset; ratione plurimum valet judicioque et prudentia (: mense proximo, qua nescio die, annum aget trigesimum nonum); doctrina existimo sana est, paratus decisioni superioris audiens esse; zelus ejus sat superquerque est notus, qui forte Gallici fervoris plusculum habet et subamarae cujusdam rigiditatis, quique, si modico mansuetudinis melle temperatus esset, et suorum palato magis gratus esset, et majoris in inveteratis curandis putidisque vulneribus esset usus, quod quidem in causa est quod non tam generatim diligatur ——— quamquam et hoc fatendum, populum hic multam partem difficilem, indocilem, ingratum, immorigerum, dyscolum, indifferentemque esse, et sine ullo omine religionis, ejus venerandum nomen blasphemare facientes. Mea quoque ipsius sors est, diris a pluribus convelli, odioq' adjectis, etiam de morte minis, satis acerbo devoveri ac proscindi, dum

interim alii, nec forte numero minores nec minus religiosi, dociles, alacres et in pietatis officiis ferventes nec male erga me affectos sese demonstrant; in quo priores gravem vix intelligo; non in temporalibus sane, cum nil recipiam, et annum medium ad Ecclesiae restaurationem remiserim, quae quidem ipsa nil hinc sibi sperare potest, non enim ad sacras liberalitates usque hujus religio populi provecta est hactenus, qui vix si Deus aut spiritus est, audivit aut vere credidit; puto spumas lunaticorum illorum ex eo maxime provenire, quod qui captivos ipsos tenet infernalis tenebrio, Domini correptus verbis, timensque expelli miseros miserrime afficiat, sed novimus haec apostolicorum operariorum esse fercula et obsonia post labores ac defatigationes; at justo longior modo haec digressio[22] ——— temporalia negotia satis dextere tractat, pietatis studiosus est, a cujus exercitio forte aliquantulum consortiorum amantior impeditur, quae tamen ab adventu meo, in ejus domo aut nulla aut rara fuerunt; ast cum foris est, invitatus non summa reluctantia renititur, quod quidem facere se inquit intuitu boni hinc sperati; haec de ipso assertio potius aliena est quam mea, quamquam tamen quoque mea; dicebat enim haereticus quidam honestioris sortis; I like very well Mr. B., but he is too fond of company. Et revera quamvis bonum aliquod forte subinde sperari detur, vereor tamen ne mala nimium praeponderent; ego potius a parte priscorum starem, v.g. Conc. Aquil. [?]: "Convivia et nimiam laicorum familiaritatem multarum offensionum et scandalorum originem debent clerici in quocumque graudu constituti declinare ac fugere," et S. Hier. ad Nep.: "Convivia tibi vitanda sunt, et maxime eorum qui honoribus tument," &, ac alibi: "Nunquam petentes, raro accipiamus rogati . . ." "Saepe fit, ut contemptui sit ecclesiastici ministerii dignitas," dicit Conc. Med. IV. Et iterum S. Hier.: "Valde despicitur clericus, qui saepe vocatus ad prandium, usu recusat etiam necessitate aliqua compulsus," & alia plura, quae quidem omnia magis in hac patria quam in nostra, ubi ea verissima ipse comperi, vera arbitror; haec sunt, quae praecipue notare potui; nec in iis quidpiam videtur apparere, quod a ministerio, terribi-[li] quidem, arcere ipsum debeat; nam supposita etiam allatorum veritate facile emendari emendenda [*sic*] poterunt seria ipsius ministerii consideratione; coeterum neminem ego nosco huic loco magis aptum;[23] interim rogo atque obtestor, ut, quam possunt minime, mea sensa in hanc determinationem influant, qui in peccatis natus sum totus.

Pro campanulis illis tribus, de quibus in anterioribus, schedulam illam cambialem 100 Dalerorum destinaveram, quam Illustr Dñatio Vestra litteris inclusam ad me misit, saltem ad tantum ex eo capiendum, quantum illis solvendis erat necessarium; in posterioribus tamen mentem meam parum immutatam reperies, casu quo necdum sint emptae; nempe praeferram (:attento quod ipse solus sumptus haud dubie sim facturus, voluntate populi, quae quondam veleitatis cujusdam speciem habuit, vix aut ne vix ad contribuendum inclinata:) ex residuo, empta unica campanula 30 dalerorum pro Ecclesia residentiae meae, libros pios, precum, catech., &., coemi quorum magna hic penuria; inter hos Scripturam S. mihi mitti optarem; quod si emptio facta sit campanularum, bene est. Mittantur in Louisville in ripa fluvii Ohio situm vicum, cum inscriptione ad virum catholicum, *De Gallon* vocatum, pistorem ibidem, quem

[22] This harsh language about the Catholics in Kentucky certainly forms a strong contrast to the praise which the friars unfailingly bestowed upon them.

[23] This certainly sets aside the statement which one reads here and there, that Father Nerinckx did not think Father Badin a suitable candidate for the miter.

33832

quamprimum rei certiorem faciam. Novas litteras cambiales huic includo in hunc finem, missas ad me particulari quodam, ut exprimit Dñus De Wolf in litteris suis; valent 105 daleros; alia adjumenta vix expecto, quae tamen non negantur sed offeruntur potius, verum cum intelligam illos circa Jesuitarum et Trappistarum institutiones plurimum occupari eisque allaborare, satius duco illis impensas fieri quibus major Dei gloria procurabitur; de me minus solicitus pro modulo, quantum licet, conabor, nec deerit mihi nunc qui semper paterne mei curam gessit utcumque indignissimi. Modica, ut mihi scribunt, spes est obtinendi ex patria nostra viros, cum qui zelosi sunt ibidem ipsi sint necessarii, et inertibus non indigeamus. Trappistae in patria nostra magis magisque tolerantur et increscunt, religiosae hospitales et filiae *charitatis dictae* a praefectis et Episcopis expetuntur, pastores fere ex mendicato vivunt, et reliqua rerum facies, aiunt, sat lugubris est. Promittunt benevoli isti homines cistam aut cistas ad petitionem meam mittere, ornamentis altaris plenas, quorum distributionem Illustriss. Dñationi Vtrae relinquent, in qua, quaeso, meminisci hujus loci non dedignabitur, populo hic praeter paupertatem bonae voluntatis defectu laborante; amant ipsi generosi et religiosi viri domum sibi assignari Philadelphiae aut New Yorki, cum directe Antverpia in alterutrum portum saepe occasio occurrit mittendi; valde autem raro Baltimorum, nisi prius Amstelodamum missio fiat, quam incommodam dicunt et sumptuosam; sed ego nescio utrum cum Philadelphiam appellunt non sit plus solvendum quam Baltimori, quod adventitii Dominicani innuunt, qui ultra 135 Daleros ibidem solvere coacti sunt, quod Illustriss. D^{a} Vtra melius noscere poterit, qualiterque se res habeat, aveo edoceri, ut ipsis quam potero citissime locum designatum annunciare valeam, et modum quo procedatur.

Fideles ad *Post Vincennes* cum R. D. Badin invisi, cui itineri mensem prope dedimus, errantes sicut oves quae perierunt invenimus, et certissimus videtur eorum totalis interitus nisi adjutrix manus advolet; pessimi sunt homines, vitiis variis libidinis maxime et perjurii immersi. Ecclesiae praecepta de festis observandis, legesque jejunii ac abstinentiae pro nihilo habentur, verbo, non est species neque decor sed contritio et infelicitas. 80 ibi circiter, puto, sunt familiae, sed plures in circuitu dispersae; vehementer desiderant sacerdotem habere, qui eis opituletur, quamquam multum timeam ut ipsi pareant; gens est otio diffluens, a labore aliena, sequax voluntatis. Necesse est sane pastoris habitatio sit ibi tristis, amara, desolata; de temporalibus tamen R. D^{s} Rivet curam habuit. Gubernator loci operam suam offert, ut advenienti sacerdoti procuret annue 200 Daleros, quos recipiebat D^{s} Rivet; quibus ego potius renunciarem, quos non dubito religionis libertati maxime nocivos, uti ex relictis quoque in domo mortuaria scriptis palam est. Sylvestrium praeterea duae tribus sunt, nempe *les Myamys et les Loups*, in quibus magna spes apparet conversionis; prior populosa habens 1500 viros ad arma aptos, posterior 800 capitum; hi jam eo processerunt [?], ut Ecclesiam habeant, in qua congregantur Dominicis et festis ad audiendum cathechismum &, qui per duos laicos mercede conductos populo proponitur; distant hi a Post Vincennes 400 fere milliaribus, illi autem in ejus fere vicinia sunt siti; obtuli me ad quamvis ex eis stationem, si ita superiori fuerit visum, uti per hasce Illmae Dñtñi Vtrae me offero, quamquam ipse fatear, non obstante bona quacumque voluntate adjuvandi proximum, oportere me magis inquirere locum, in quo numerum mensium meorum flendo lugendoque transigam judicium durissimum expectaturus; instantissime tamen iterum repeto, insisterem ut ad aliquos horum derelictorum mitterer,

nisi absolutissima nullitas mea contrarium clamaret; videtur omnino quoque necessarium in aliquo locorum istorum Episcopatum erigere, attentis locorum distantiis cujus consilio, statutis ac decisionibus stetur, nec suspensi animi in varia detorqueantur, multoque promptius is media adinveniret, sine obice aut dilatione de mediis judicandi ac decernendi quae e re Ecclesiae esse valerent.

In Louisville spes magna apparet obtinendae quamprimum Ecclesiae, si sacerdos sit, qui hanc subinde valeat visitare; imo audeo dicere ac certum videtur, pro numero sacerdotum fidelium quoque numerus augeretur: O mittat Dominus operarios in messem, quia multa jam alba sunt ad illam! Quod autem illustriss. Dñatio Vestra dignetur hic me consolatorem consiliariumque agere viri luminis tanti ac experientiae, videtur mea quidem mente abs re esse, nisi dicendae sint tenebrae luci lucem tenebrositate sua addere, aut, quod fere idem innuit, ut luceat lux magis efficere. Certum interim est Rvdum illum Dm nullo meo consilio aut re indigere, quo tamen obstante non longius migrare intendo nisi in domum illam, in cujus possessionem me induxit, ubi, quo res melius agantur praesentem me esse oportet, cuique soli loco, utcumque modico, invigilando, toto, ut dicitur, meo homine opus habeo, sicut duae congregationes reliquae Sti Caroli et Stae Annae nimirum quantum vires meas excedant. Hoc est dictamen mentis meae, paratae interea ad maxime contraria quaevis; obedientia enim excusationi locum tribuet aliquem, ubi ausus temerarii ratio sufficiens nequit inveniri.[34]

Trappistarum res satis tarde procedunt ac lente, cujus congregationis quidem ruinam timeo, nisi novis auxiliis hominum ac nummorum, quae utraque promittuntur ex patria nostra, fulciatur; prospere magis, videtur, omnia fierent si R. P. Urbain, quod frequenter ipsemet illi suggessi, ab humilioribus fundamentis ordiretur, nec de eligendo loco ad defatigationem usque anxiaretur; verendum ne continuis suis excursionibus rem minuat, minusq' bonae de Trapistis opinioni ac famae consulat.

De Dominicanis nostris binis haud dubito, quin R. Ds Badin sit sua sensa traditurus. Vix equidem jam haesitare potest quin prognosticam meam assertionem oculatus arbiter agnoscat, speculatione tanta differunt ab ipso, praxi vero in quibusdam tota. Quantum vero jam dicere expediat, quantumve dici valeat, vix ausim censor esse; interim hoc asseveranter, puto, pronunciare possum: Fortasse gentem multiplicabunt, sed non magnificabunt laetitiam nec faciem terrae renovabunt. Hoc verum est; petulci nostri insolescunt magis, et qui sin amore metu saltem tantisper coercebantur laxatis jam habenis proruunt ac extento collo incedunt refugii civitatem invenisse se ovantes; plurimum sibi insuper promittunt ex adventu duorum residuorum, qui indulgentias plenarias non de poenis peccato remissa culpa debitis sed et de reatu culpae incurrendo allaturi expectantur vel ardentissime; forte minus exactus sum dum plurali numero promiscue utor, nam videtur P. Tuite, paucioribus tamen litteris excultus, justae disciplinae addictior; alter autem ut apparet, multis litteris, siquidem multis, non ad insaniam sed ad mollitiem, quae forte propter salis acrimoniae defectum infatuatio dici potest, adductus est: mollem illum vocat R. Ds. Badin, apud populum *easy* audit; utrum tamen ad exorbitantes laxistas relegandus sit judex nolim esse.

---

[34] This indicates that Saint Ann's was still under Father Nerinckx's jurisdiction; but it seems certain that Father Wilson attended the mission from early in 1806, and that it had already been determined to place it permanently under the Dominicans.

Ego rigidus censeor, R. Ds. Badin rigidior et acrior;[25] verumtamen pleriqui ab acribus ac pungentibus (:si tamen nostra talia revera sint:) veram sanationem potius citiusque sperantes, mellitaq' apium arbitrantes fastidire incipiunt, ac pristina remedia inquirunt, pacem inter et pacem justum tantaeque, id est, aeternae consequentiae, discrimen subolentes.

Ab illius R. P. adventu res matrimonialis (:haec enim antequam ipse huc advenerim, multi rumoris ac murmuris occasio fuerat:) omnino pro votis equorum ac mulorum in parte carnali decisa est, quamvis in re sacramentali pro sanctitate nihil hactenus videatur inventum; omnia jam licent in matrimonio et forte brevi omnia expedient. Res eo est, uti relatum est mihi, ut quaedam dixerit, laxato hoc ursi sui fune se amplius ferenda non esse: *I kan no more*; quae antea intra honesti tori repagula naturae regulis laeta vivebat, religionisque gaudebat adjumentis ac sacris laetabatur juribus, a bruti insanientis secura excessibus. Porro doctrina ista si vera sit, actum est de ritualibus nostris, de pastoralibus, &.&., de omnibus dicam christianae praxeos regulis; insulse sane (:sit dicto venia:) Tobias egerit, priusquam hoc sacramentum magnum in Ecclesia esset, tot sanctae castitatis conjugalis, finisque conjugalis copulae sancti tam expressa edendo vota ac specimina; vereorque ne forte quaedam (:pudet dicere!) sortem subeant uxoris illius Levitae Jud. 19, non alienis exfornicatae libidinibus, sed propriorum enecatae carnali furore, succumbant. O quam pulchra est casta generatio! Istae similesque speculationes ac praxes, si pro genio cujusque contra mandatum Domini, apostoli repetitum consilium omnemque sanorum scholasticorum opinionem pro praxeos regula debeant haberi, non video, quid spiritui privato haereticorum valeat juste opponi. Hoc solum restabit, ut cum pagano condoleamus infelicitati Ecclesiae saeculorum praecedentium, et fideles illorum temporum dicamus miserrimos, quibus haec porta empyrii fuit clausa, quorum plurimi essent damnati, qui quod honestum est turpe existimantes, a propriis sacerdotibus male instructi ac decepti ex conscientia erronea peceaverunt. Longior hic fortasse sum, quamquam vix dicendi finem inveniam; sed parcet solita vestra benignitas, confido.[26]

Hoc interim ardentissime desiderarem, ut (:si forte iste ordo figat mansionem, quod vix credam, attenta quam praevideo modica pecuniaria assistentia, consideratoque quod non a tam humilibus videantur initiis velle incipere:) ut regularis observantiae verus amator et animarum zelo plene accensus ex alio quodam ordinis illius coenobio huc advocari posset; quid

---

[25] Compare Father Nerinckx's original given here (from the words: "*Forte minus exactus sum dum plurali numero promiscue utor,*" to this point) with Maes' rendition of it (*Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx*, p. 174); and do not overlook that author's quotation marks. The "*alter*" *pater* was Father Wilson. Here is Father Maes' translation: "The people call these reverend gentlemen *easy;* Rev. Badin pronounces them extreme *laxists*, and I (who, although severe, look upon my colleague as altogether too rigid and stern,) think that he is not mistaken in his estimate of them." Compare also Maes' parenthetical clause with the parenthetical clause in the next line of the text: "(*si tamen nostra talia revera sint*)."

[26] All this excoriation of the Dominicans is one paragraph covering three long, closely written pages. We have taken the liberty of dividing it into several. Compare this paragraph with Maes' rendition of it in *op. cit.*, p. 175. In a footnote on the same page he attempts to prove that Father Nerinckx had "formed a correct idea of the state of affairs at St. Rose's" when no such place as Saint Rose's existed. But for further information on this matter see article, pp. 15–45. Surely no one, not even Fathe Maes himself, can justly take exception to our attempt to set right all this misrepresentation and unfair treatment.

enim de tali institutione Religioni decoris sperandum aut veri nominis boni, ubi homines seipsos satis amantes, pondusque diei et aestus plusculum exhorrescentes, a regularis disciplinae censore ac custode tanto remoti spatio, plebis catholicae mores cui praeerunt, ad suorum normam formabunt? quos quidem absit ut improbos dicam, tamen vix religiosae observantiae zelo animatos aestimabo. Plura hic scribere nec jam vacat, R. P. Urbain jamjam has in itinere ad vos secum assumpturo, nec forte rebus non satis hactenus plenis ac maturis convenit. Quae autem querulus satisque fortasse acris, miserrimus ipse ego ac nequissimus patri ac Episcopo scribo non rogatus quidem [27], solius, confido, gloriae Dei zelo, si modo dicreto [discreto?] satis, et rei christianae amore sunt exarata, ut quantum fieri potest, si religiosae institutiones, quod optandum, hic locum inveniant, allaboretur ut viri perfecti, quod perfectionis status sonat, obtineantur; quorum enim vana est religio aut vix a saeculari discreta commercio, novimus in patria nostra nunquam satis flenda experientia quantum religoni obfuerint, hic autem majus hinc timendum malum, si quos nos perfectos vocatione viros gloriamur communis aut mollioris forte vitae homines deprehendant, sicque pro aedificatione iis, qui ex adverso sunt, scandalum detur. Ideam quidem minus favorabilem mihi impresserant de hujus collegii patribus vix ante ne nomine quidem mihi notis omni exceptione majores viri nostrates, illi ipsi, qui missionis Americanae rem tam zelose amant curare, cum unus eorum mihi dicebat velle se, ut si forte comites illos haberem in maris trajectu, tamen quantum possem a familiari consuetudine abstinerem; noverant enim R. PP. viam media in persecutione totius electi cleri nostri libere incedendi et obambulandi tyranno ipsis, quo titulo Deus scit, uti juratoribus parcendo, quod saltem bonis omnibus violenter suspectum semper visum fuit; ad hoc *bons* usi sunt ad emendas possessiones suas, quod zelantes pro religione plus satis probarunt fieri non potuisse sine expressa vel tacita accessione ad tyranni votum; deinde P. Wilson ipse in officialem publicum a gubernio electus fuit, Praefectoque Departiment multum acceptus, collegium eorum varios numerabat alumnos, filios hominum parti tyranizanti aut addictorum aut subservientium, quibus si addamus expressiones quasdam in favorem status miseri Ecclesiae Gallicanae, quam pius nullus non videt amaritudine amarissima repletam, vix dubitare ausim, quin talis farinae viri cautissime sunt tractandi, qui si iniquitati volentes nomen non dederint, tamen usque ad scandalosam mollitiem condescenderunt; praevidensque jam, quod illi ipsi, talium principiorum morumque viri (:delicatuli enim sunt, sat bonam valetudinis et corporis curam agentes, non tamen sunt potui multum dediti:) sint aliquando futuri, si res ipsis succedat, Seminarii KKyani professores, aut saltem pro longo tempore, ni aliter misericors providentia disponat, numerosiorem constituturi cleri hujus partem [28]. De his omnibus paulo amplius verba facere ad cautelam oportere me censui, ne fortasse tacuisse postea poeniteat, seroque paretur aliquando medicina; interim non pluris haec mea

[27] These words prove conclusively that Father Nerinckx wrote these things solely on his own initiative. But see Maes's translation (*op. cit.*, p. 176, second paragraph) of the end of the document: "Since you expect me to look after the interests of religion in this region." These words, in spite of that translator, are *not* in the document.

[28] In rebuttal of all this see article, pp. 31–33.

expositio valeat opto, quam attenta frivolitate mea, ac pudenda miseria valere judicabitur.[28a]

Sunt et alia quaedam quae scribere luberet, sed per tempus non licet. Hoc tamen addam pro laude populi hujus plurimam partem utut dyscoli, multam in iis mea opinione spem boni inveniri, si animarum eorum directores utut exacti, et, si placet, etiam stricti, modo mansueti, mites et infirmitatis eorum condolentes sint; acerbitas ipsos terret, sed pietas paterna etiam invitos trahit; defectu tamen *sacerdotum* necesse est ut plurimi pereant, quod quidem quantopere me, utcumque indolentem, affligeat non sum [par?] exprimendo."

Alias hic iterum includo litteras cambiales, quas particularis quidam per D. DeWolf ad me misit; dignabitur opto Illtriss. Dñatio Vtra illius curam habere, expensasque quae in gratiam meam factae sunt, solvere. Veniam itaque humillime petens de omni gravamine quod vobis causo; precibus, si quid valeo, conabor resarcire. Coeterum enixis votis pro duplici vestra prosperitate bonorum omnium largitorem incessanter obtestans, qua par est filiali observantia, debitaq' reverentia, studio animoque signor

Illustrissmae ac Reverendiss. Dñationis Vtrae

humillimus obedientissimq.

SERVUS C. NERINCKX,

prbr.

P. S. Plurimum salutis illustrissimo coadjutori, Rdis DD Beeston, Brosius, &c., aliisque benevolis nostris, quorum post vestras, precibus sacrificiisque totum me commendo.[29]

Document No. 5 is only a postscript to a letter that can no longer be found in the Baltimore Archives. Taken together with a later letter of date, March 21, 1807 (Baltimore Archives, Case 8 A, U 4), it shows that the document of which it was a part, was long, largely devoted to the missionary's ideas of the Dominicans, severe in the extreme, and aimed at preventing the friars from becoming the professors of the future diocesan seminary. With this latter point, however, Father Nerinckx needed not to have troubled himself, for nothing seems to have been farther from the friars' minds.

P. S. Paratis jam ad discessum litteris sat temporis superest ut notulas quasdam superaddam. Mors viri vere plorandi a digna tanto viro vidua matrona nunciata nulli dubio locum linquit; Dominus De Wolf ergo obiit, verum mihi amicum ereptum lugeo damnumque non vulgare ambae Indiae sentient; interim Dominus est, qui disposuit, quod bonum est in occulis suis faciat! Erat huic religioso viro intimus amicus, zelo hujus simili aut eodem animatus, rerum gerendarum justitia ac theologica etiam scientia supra sortem

[28a] One cannot suppress a feeling of astonishment at seeing Father Maes (*op. cit.*, p. 176) translate the latter part of this paragraph: "I feel all the more free, my Lord, in writing to you as I have done, from the fact that I foresee that the Dominicans will be professors of our Ecclesiastical Seminary, or at least will constitute a majority of our clergy, if providence does not interfere; and I might be sorry afterward, but too late, not to have spoken my mind on the subject, since you expect me to look after the interests of Religion in this region. . . . " Our surprise is all the greater because the last clause is not only an interpolation, but is in ill accord with Father Nerinckx's statement referred to in note 27; while the whole paragraph, as rendered by Maes, is so toned down as to make the Belgian missionary's charges the more plausible by making them less bitter and extravagant.

[29] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 1.

suam instructus, confessorum nostratium hortator et consolator, principique De Gallitzen, quam pariter vita functam intelligo ac doleo, familiaris; est viro huic nomen J. Peemans. Mercator est satis dives Lovanii, ubi habitat prope canalem, quem quidem puto ad Revdiss. Dnatem Vestram litteras dedisse. Videtur omnino e re Christiana in hac regione futurum, si zelotae hujus pius zelus litteris foveatur, casuque quo ego aut alii, inter quos praesertim Jesuitae duo novelli ex ea regione adventitii, aut forte Illustriss. Dnatio Vtra ipsa, cui et novum hunc annum et alios post hunc multos totis votis benedictione coeli plenos exopto, e vivis evocaretur, res taliter disponantur, ut cooperatione viri illius iter servetur apertum et Missionariis in hanc Regionem, et iis, quibus Missiones valeant juvari.

Nuperrime mihi dicebat R. P. Urbanus expectare se ornamenta ex Europa, quae ipsi et Rdiss^{o} Episcopo competebant; nil ad hoc respondi, sed ad me scripsit Ds Peemans & Ds De Wolf, quod coemissent ac congregassent varia ad ornatum Ecclesiarum nostrarum, qualiter res se habeat ignoro; sed et praeterea scribit ad me soror mea varia quoque comparata ex pecunia ad me pertinente et ab aliis procurata, quibus forte pecunia quoque aliqua addetur, imagines pro catechese, Crucifixi, Rosaria, &, pro quibus jam tertio scripsi; horum non dubito quin mentio sit exprimenda in litteris; idem nuntiat vidua Dñi De Wolf, quae etiam addit Remonstrantiam, Ciboriumque et casulas, &, mittenda fore; hos ergo articulos, quantum fieri potest, ad me mitti optarem, cum partim sint futuri mei proprii, partim mihi donati, cumque nullum hic sit medium super habendi quidquam in Ecclesiis, nisi quod ex propriis coemimus, totumque meum, quod valde modicum est, in hunc finem expenditur. Ipsa vidua De Wolf spondet se pro me facturam uti piae memoriae maritus ejus mihi promiserat, petitque assignari modum faciliorem, de quo in superioribus mentio, mittendi quod volunt in Americam ad certum correspondentem, et an similia quaevis liceat huc inferre, ad quod respondi ipsi licere. Sic enim opinor.

1 *Januarii* 1807.

Diu multumque deliberavi, utrum hanc de Dominicanis mentionem facere deberem; nempe miserrimus ipse confundi deberem, cum vel minima de proximo defavorabilis suspicio animum pulsat. Sed ad scribendum compulerunt me rationes sequentes. 1^{a} Videtur gloria Dei et bonum proximi, in nova Ecclesia hac, requirere ut omnes possibiles cautelae adhibeantur. 2^{a} Memor praesertim quot modo infelices sacerdotes haec nova Ecclesia passa sit, ac ipso hoc tempore iterum (:qui casus hic quidem populo huic hactenus ignotus est) patrem Flyn [*sic*] spatio aliquo temporis hibernum [?], nullis instructum credentialibus ex Episcopi parte; hic vir ex testimonialium defectu si non suspectus, saltem minus probatus, ex consensu tamen R. Dñi Badin in quibusdam Ecclesiis conciones habuit congregationesque varias obivit nunquam tamen confessarius nisi paucissimorum, quem quidem ego judicabam satius in monasterio Trappistarum remansurum. Ut vero fatear verum non sunt hic fundatae contra ipsum quaerelae factae, sed ut jam ex rescriptis ejus intelligimus in Sti Ludovici aut alio ibidem Louisianae loco, ut litteralis est epistolae ejus sensus, intrusit se pastorem, vel potius a Laicis, aedituis nempe, intrusus est, quamquam, benignius interpretando, credere debeamus a vicario ibidem generali ipsum jurisdictionem habuisse, nullis tamen instructum testimoniis episcopalibus, quia, ut jam videmus, Illusstma Dantne Vtra omnem illi denegante positive jurisdictionem; faxit Deus, ut negotium hoc

infaustum non habeat finem![30] maxime cum vicarius ille ipse, Maxville [Maxwell] opinor nomen est, apud catholicos nostros non tota famae integritate gaudeat, cujus R. Ds Badin se dicit aliquando mentionem ingesisse in litteris ad Illustrissm Dntm Vtram datis; absit tamen simile quid de Dominicanis suspicari, quod potius de me ipso timendum esset, cujus quidem timore et securius certiusque uni necessario, animae scilicet saluti propriae consulendi causa, in animum iterum admisi cogitatum quem in patria nostra tantisper foveram, Trappistarum nempe ordinem ingrediendi, maxime summa Regulae observantia post novorum adventum virorum illectus, ac praesentissimae certissimaeque ruinae meae in missionaria vocatione periculo ad stuporem perculsus, arbitransq' legatione mihi imposita functum me abunde, cum transmarimum iter primus tendando aliis occasio et hortator fuerim ad sequendum in hanc regionem, in qua sperandum fore ut fructum centesimum faciant. 3a Quia Patri certus sum me scribere, cujus sagaci pietati ac discretioni res scrutanda tuto justeque committatur. 4a Ut verum fatear, stomachum mihi parumper moveri sensi, intelligens Patrem Wilson gratis asseruisse Dm Stevens, quem alii melioribus argumentis temporis hujus Athanasium vocarunt, interdictum aut suspensum esse et censura notatum propter importunum scriptandi zelum, sub eadem sane censura erat S. Athanasius et alii quivis qui pro muro aeneo Ecclesiae fuerunt adversus quosvis Ecclesiae desertores aut persecutores et ignavos propugnatores. Praeterea falsa nimis est et a calumnia vix distans assertio, meliusque esset solidas quasdam redargutiones in medium adducere, quibus moderni illius Athanasii oracula labefactentur, sed tam vasto in imperio tota saeculi illuminatione adjutus nemo hactenus id attentare publice verbo aut scripto ausus est, nedum P. Wilson praetendet facere[31]. Omnibus ergo bene combinatis videtur in cunctis hisce transparere, salvo meliori, segnior pro defendendis orthodoxae fidei principiis zelus, justo quaedam major in erraticam pravitatem indulgentia, ac tepescens quidam ad currendam arctam Evangelii viam fervor, contra praeclarum effatum Excell. Episcopi Grassensis (A. Godeau) dicentis: "In declarationibs casuum contingentium sequimini hoc generale axioma; ut eligatis semper eam opinionem, per quam Deus magis glorificatur, et quae majorem habet conformitatem cum arcta via Evangelli." 5a Quod nihil intenderem nisi Illustm Dnatm Vtram pro modulo meo rogare obtestarique, ut quantum fieri potest, alii ordinis ejusdem viri probati vereque ad Religionem propagandam apti religiosi advocentur, qui hic praesint ut prosint. Hisce unis ac solis vicibus mentem sat superque expressam autumans finio, ac si quaedam ausu temerario aut indiscreto sint expressa veniam precans, ausim protestari sine bile aut felle, sed propter solam conscientiam scripsisse, quod cum

[30] Bishop Spalding (*Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky*, pp. 259ff.), speaks of this clergyman in terms of high praise. Certainly could anything of a really serious character have been said against those early Dominicans, it would have found a place in the uncharitable documents of the day. That nothing of the kind is recorded proves them to have been splendid priests. It may be further submitted here that Father Nerinckx's frequently recurring "*miserrimus ipse*," his confusion at casting the slightest suspicion on others, and his protests at writing thus solely "for the glory of God and the good of his neighbor" ill accord with his many caustic strictures. Perhaps, after all, Rev. G. I Chabrat does not deserve the censure that has been passed on him for consigning that missionary's writings to the flames.

[31] As the reader will doubtless remark, Father Nerinckx, as is the case with nearly all the others, makes this charge on mere hearsay. However, history would hardly place Rev. Cornelius Stevens on so high a pedestal as Father Nerinckx would have him occupy.

fecerim forte nunc ad nauseam in posterum exoneratum me ac exemptum censendi ratio erit abundans.[32]

Father Nerinckx's letters, with all his humility, show him to have been superlatively sensitive—too much so for his own happiness. This, it seems to the writer, was the cause of much of his worry. The documents again indicate that his troubles were largely imaginary, and that he gave too ready an ear to gossip. Pious and zealous though he was, his sensitiveness, imagination and proclivity to accept idle talk at its face-value led him, at times, into the most bitter and violent language. In harsh invective the document, which we are now to lay before the reader, surpasses even that of June 2, 1806. For the reply to these reiterated charges against the Dominicans the reader is again referred to the article mentioned (pp. 15-45). The extravagance to which the good man could go, in his perfervid moments, is evidenced by the ultra-severe attack of this letter on Basil Elder, father of the late saintly Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati, an exemplary Catholic, and an intimate and trusted friend of the metropolitans of Baltimore from Carroll to Spalding.

J. M. J.

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine!

A paucis septimanis litteras vobis destinandas Revdo Dño Badin tradidi; post has rursum officiosissimas ab Illustrissima Dominatione Vestra accepi, quae quo sunt magis sincerae eo quoque magis ad confundendum me sunt aptae. Litteras meas sat longas invenies, minus tamen quam, eas esse optarem, sed taediosas nimis. In ipsis mentionem facio dubii debiti numerarii, quo forte obstringor, rationem reddo deinde de distributione facta ornamentorum sacrorum, quae maximam partem ex propriis meis et consanguineorum liberalitate religiosa sunt comparata; tum unam aut alteram paginam impleo, non Apologistam agendo pro me, cujus hactenus, pro summa Dei optimi in me clementia, necdum indigui, et dubito perquam, utrum etiam illius unquam, nisi gloria Dei aut bono proximi id requirente, usum sim facturus, sed aliquam reddo rationem praxis meae, quam 20 et amplius annos, sub oculis tot venerabilium virorum, martyrum forte aut intrepidissimorum orthodoxae fidei certo confessorum in agitatissima patria nostra, sub insignissimo Duce Joanne Henrico Eminentissimo illo Cardinale, sine ulla contradictione secutus sum, et ad quam sequendam ab iisdem ipsis sum et verbis animatus et scriptis, quae reposita apud me servo, non ut laudis hinc aliquid circumferam, cum praeter confusionem nil mihi juste supersit in tempore et in aeternitate, sed ut sint quasi quaedam regula, quam inoffense liceat sequi. Tandem facta matura reflectione super actuali rei catholicae hic statu et positione mea praesente ac illa, quam sine dubio futuram tandem praevideo ex rebus contingentibus et anfractibus, per quos inimicus homo mala sua pellit, priusquam major procella fiat, finivi litteras meas dando dimissionem meam cum gratiarum actione infinita pro tot tantisque in me beneficentiis ab Illustrissima Dominatione Vestra toties

[32] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 3.—Another letter of March 21, 1807 (*ibid.*, U 4), shows that the lost document of which the above postscript was a part, contained a whole list (*elenchus*) of charges against the laxity, want of zeal, etc., in the friars; and that the object of all this was to prevent them from getting charge of the future diocesan seminary. The words: "*Hisce unis ac solis vicibus mentem sat superque expressam autumans*," etc., at the end of the postscript, would indicate that Father Nerinckx had forgotten how often he had written on the same topic. In spite of his protest that he is now finished with the matter, he recurs to it, at least, again and again in his letters for the next three years or more.

repetitis; hoc unum addebam, ut liceret pro tempore, quo hic degerem, in privata domo sacra facere.

Res, mea quidem opinione, pejores, magis seriae et sequelarum pessimarum evadere possunt; notitiam aliquam dare, quamvis non dubitem, quin tota res sit amplissime vobis referenda, mei muneris duxi pro gloria Dei, quam, prout affectus sum et sentio, nullo tamen ordine, promam.

1° Dissentionum, arrogantiae et tumultuantis petulantiae hujus populi verissima Epocha est adventus Dominicanorum in hanc Regionem; ante hoc tempus nil, quod inveniri potest, in publicum hujusmodi prodiit, et si quaedam minus grata laterent, a discolis quibusdam clam absumenda erant sine ullo multitudinis damno, cujus erat passim, sin modo, anima una saltem brevissime unienda ad opus quodlibet etiam perfectum; res porro sic procecisset, si RR. illi PP., uti ego volens obligatus feci, inquisiissent a vicario Episcopi et Pastore loci de vitiis eradicandis, de virtutibus plantandis,&. Nec ego hactenus video, cur ab hoc ordinario, canonico et necessario ac indispensabili modo deviarint, nisi vel ut hominibus placeant, quod nescio utrum consecuti sint, aut sine ministerii injuria consequi possint; vel ut commodis suis studeant, quae res satis ipsis, ut puto, ex voto cessit, cum interim pro bono generali Ecclesiae nil sit, quod factum ab ipsis possit monstrari. Quaecumque congerunt quomodocumque ad domus propriae usum applicant; fabrica, forte quia animum habent titulum illius Eccesliae extinguendi et ad S. Rosam transferendi, quod etiam de Ecclesia sperata in Springfield vereor, Stae Annae in eodem omnino statu est, in quo illam ipse reliqui. Quoad regimen spirituale, (:in insipientia dico:) erat ibi melius ante adventum illorum quam in ulla alia congregatione; abhorrebant a publicis conventiculis maxime nocturnis, a choreis, a matrimoniis cum haereticis et consanguineis, ab habitu mundano et ornatu; infantes et adolescentes maximam navabant pietati et doctrinae christianae operam, publicis nempe certaminibus et proemiis stimulabantur. Conjugati ab omni licentia statui injuriosa scrupulose et ex virtutis motivo abstinebant, Dominicis diebus religiose ac pie a summo mane ad finem usque officii pars maxima et vere magna in templo praesto erat; nunc autem, uti audio, omnia haec transierunt velut umbra; matrimonia cum haereticis ineuntur vel facillime. De causis matrimonialibus alias scripsi. Miror ego quod de haereticis aliquando Erasmus, laxistarum et molliorum confessariorum eorumque poenitentium semper in nuptias aut choreas exire tumultus, indeque comicam magis quam Evangelicam videri praxim. Nempe in Scot [t] Cty, in Stae Annae in Simpsons Creek felium viscera plurium pedes electricarunt. O miseram pietatem quae hisce eget animalis exercitiis!!! Saltationes diurnae permittuntur et peccata non sunt, et sic de aliis (:nam amo brevis esse:) quae quidem, quod nunquam somniavi, si concederem mala non esse, numquam tamen adhuc eo potui penetrare, cur saltem recepta hic, et sine murmure servata (:paucis exceptis:) non servarint, cum nullis immutatione sua prosint, et plurimis, quod forte magis postea patebit, obsint; nec de hac novorum daemoniorum annuntiatione Ecclesia habet quod sibi gratuletur. Quod si ab insensato etiam audire consilium liceat, ego cathegorice ab ipsis exquirerem, velint ne Missionarii esse aut Religiosi tantum manere? Nempe jam passim missionarium agunt ubi commodi hinc aliquid sperare datur, et Religiosos tantum se dicunt ubi tantum labor subeundus, hujus ego testis esse possum; pro parte autem, quam in Missionibus habere vellent, omnino jurisdictioni Vicarii illos subjectos vellem et communi Ecclesiae bono intentos; pro parte vero monachali omnino ad severioris disciplinae nor-

mam adhortarer, ad ipsosque evocarem homines quosdam, vero illius ordinis spiritu plenos, aut ab ordinis generali postularem. Cujus autem characteris hi relgiosi sint, ipse quantum potui aliquando vobis coram exposui, ac certior fieri poteris, illustrissime Domine, per excellentem illum amicum Lovaniensem D. Peemans, qui (:nisi forte piae memoriae Ds De Wolf fuerit:) de caute cum eis agendo me praemonuit. Nam modice mihi noti erant. Haec sufficiant pro semper.[33]

2° Est apud vos versipellis quidam de grege homuncio, Basilius, melius Basiliscus, Elder qui plurima venena in has usque partes evomit, quamquam quidem a bonis quibusvis, imo et ab haereticis honestioribus, cum paucis adhaerentibus sibi, contemptui habeatur ; pro injuriis, quibus, a me nunquam provocatus, me afficit publice (:nam litterae ejus publice legendae traduntur:) ex corde ipsi remitto, quia in eo crassissimam admitto ignorantiam et stupidissimam. Tali dedicatore damnationis nostrae etiam gloriamur. Tertul. de Nerone. Addito huic, quod et qui accusationis schedam conscripsit a pauculis signatam, sit homo de animantium potius quam hominum genere; hoc volo tantum, ut recordetur in amaritudine animae suae, si callosa necdum sit, quas turbas concitaverit in Domo Dei, quarum sit causa sequelarum, et serio de reparatione cogitet. Ego sincerrissime judico hominem hujusmodi sacramentis ullis indignissimum priusquam de reparato scandalo planissime constet. Gloriatur tenebrio ille, se ab illustrissima Dominatione Vestra omnium quae dicit, vel plurium saltem, testimonia ac faventes habere rationes. Ego vero non dubito, quin mendaciter et gratis id asserat; tamen, ut candidus sim, vereor, ne litterae (:ego nullas hactenus vidi:) quae nomine illustrissimae Dominationis Vestrae circumferuntur a paucis istis hypocriticis et rebellibus familiis, multum pondus tribuant calumniis eorum; lugebo multum, si unquam verae sint, et quod ostentant contineant, quia, quomodo reparari res possit, non invenio, nisi forte cap. ult. Libri Esther suggerere modum quemdem valeret.[34]

3° Summa capitum accusationum contra me, quantum expiscari possum ex dictis et scriptis et propriae conscientiae interrogatione, haec est: 1°. Surrectio matutina hora 4ª. Hujus accusator est R. P. Fenwick, et haec quidem hora est, quam ipse tenere deberet. Sed fallitur, dum dicit me longius dormientibus absolutionem negare. Si nosceret R.P., quid in Paraguay Jesuitae introduxerint, et devotiones in Belgio usitatas, ipse hora 4ª pro servis et ancillis missam celebraret.[35] 2°. Prohibeo promiscue choreas ut malas. 3°. Prohibeo visitationes promiscuas inter diversi sexus personas. 4°. Probibeo et aversor matrimonia cum haereticis &. 5°. Requiro ante matrimonium praeparationem ad Banna et Sacramenta frequentanda. 6°. Regulas in ipso Matrimonio servandas praescribo. 7°. Preces diebus Dominicis et festivis toto mane, publicas, servatis intersticiis, mando. 8°. Continuas exactiones facio pro fabricis Ecclesiarum (:fortunate non dicunt quod mihi ipsi illas faciam:). 9°. Prohibeo excessum vestium et ornatum obscoenum (:addam ego, quod et censores foeminas habeam aetatis provectae, quae in Ecclesiis huic invigilent:). 10°. Acerbior sum in correctionibus dandis &. Basil Elder vocat me tyrannum.[36]

[33] For the reply to these renewed charges see article, pp. 35–36.

[34] For further information on Basil Elder, and how Maes gives the name as "B—E—," and otherwise renders this paragraph, see article, pp. 36–37.

[35] Maes, *op. cit.*, p. 180, translates the second sentence of this accusation: "Rev. Father Fenwick is my accuser on this head, and that is the hour that he himself as a religious ought to keep." But, as the reader will notice, the clause "as a religious" is not in the original. Yet the last sentence, about Paraguay, etc., which shows the mind of Father Nerinckx, is left out altogether by that author.

[36] Maes, *op. cit.*, p. 180, again renders Basil Elder "B—E—"

Tandem dicunt: apud me is too much confinement. Hoc si verum sit, miror cur quotidie tam multi a mane ad vesperam quocumque vado fores et aures meas obsideant? Si sint alia praeter haec crimina, de quibus accusor, ignoro; ego autem cum similes praxes in vita S. Caroli aut alterius sancti lego, puto has ad eorum commendationem plurimum facere, et ego nescio quale foret ferendum judicium de illo confessario, qui attentaret poenitentes suos ad directe oppositam praxium mearum obligare vel inducere: v.g. nullam ante matrimonium requiri praeparationem, nullas in Mat.o sequendas rglas &. Deinde si vera nostra sunt crimina, cur non canonice citamur &. &. ad quid condemnamur in populo priusquam convincamur in judicio?

4o Plures de populo nostro lugent hanc calamitatem, turmatim se offerunt ad signandam contra calumniatores protestationem; id quidem me inscio fecerunt, et Dominica seqte intendo omnino prohibere, ut causam meam agant, quia nemini injuriam me fecisse cognosco; ideoque cuncta Domino commendo, qui quod bonum est in oculis suis faciet. Interim gaudeo, quod huc venerim nulla temporali spe animatus, gaudeo insuper quod nil hic temporale acceperim, sed et cuncta, quae divina providentia mihi fuerat largita, expenderim ad majorem ut puto ejus gloriam. Unum omnino doleo, quod cum nostrates mei sacerdotes horum notitiam habuerint, animo minus alacri forte sint adventuri; ego tamen ad veniendum invitare illos non desinam. Haec sunt pauca, Illustrissime Domine, quae superioribus meis addenda judicavi. Iterum atque iterum orationibus benevolentiaeq' vestrae commendatus, cum voto quantocius recipiendi dimissoriales vestras, quae simul testimoniales aliquae sint, signor votis perfectissimis

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine

Humillimus obedientiss'q'
Vtr Servus,
C. Nerinckx.

30 *Junii*, 1808.[37]

The above documents may be considered in the nature of *pièces justificatives* to the article in the present issue of the Review. Many other documents might be added as source-material for the subject, but we venture to state that those given will enable the reader to form a truer perspective of the well-known misunderstanding between these two pioneer missionaries and the Dominicans of Kentucky.

V. F. O'Daniel, O.P.

[37] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 8 A, U 5.

BOOK REVIEWS

Very Rev. Charles Hyacinth McKenna, O.P., P.G., Missionary and Apostle of the Holy Name Society, by Very Rev. V. F. O'Daniel, O.P., S.T.M. The Holy Name Bureau, New York, 1917. Pp. xiv + 409.

This work is a labor of love, and as such bears on every page traces of that admiration and affection which the disciple rightly pays to the great master at whose feet he sat for years, and whose spirit he endeavors to imprison in these pages. Father Charles McKenna ranks very high among the zealous missionaries who toiled in the American Catholic Church during the decades immediately following the Civil War. The son of Irish farmers, inured to labor from his youth, compelled to emigrate (1848) at the tender age of thirteen for the reason which drove across the seas in those years the flower of Ireland's manhood and womanhood, his ideal was the holy priesthood, and he followed it with tenacity until he saw himself arrayed in the Dominican habit and empowered to work for the salvation of souls. Quite apropos does his biographer say (p. xiv): "To young men aspiring to the service of the altar, but deprived of the means of attaining their holy ambition, Father McKenna's life cannot fail to be an inspiration. To Christ's anointed it will ever be a model of every priestly virtue and an exemplar after which to pattern their own lives." For nearly fifty years this apostolic man preached east and west, in season and out of season, in cities and towns and hamlets, wherever duty called him, the great saving truths of the Catholic religion. His splendid physique, the stern regularity of his habits, and his iron will enabled him humanly to accomplish herculean tasks of endurance in the pulpit, the confessional, and the office. But to many it seemed as if only a special assistance of the Holy Spirit could sustain the man of God amid so many and so continuous demands upon his strength and his zeal. His zeal literally devoured his strength and drove him to ever renewed inroads upon it, until he sank exhausted in the unequal combat and gave up his pure and holy soul (1917) into the hands of his Maker in whose

service he had consumed every gift and opportunity that came his way.

Dr. O'Daniel follows chronologically the labors of Father McKenna in the routine life of the missionary—sermons, instructions, exhortations; confessions, visits to the sick and the stubborn; consultation and correspondence; writing of booklets and leaflets; travel and other hardships—every channel of religious activity in search of souls more or less astray from God. In all this there is, of course, a striking similarity to the labors of other missionaries less famous than the great Dominican, but similarly active in the service of the sinful and the lukewarm, the backslider and the apathetic. It was the Holy Name Society which brought into play the virtues of Father McKenna as a spiritual leader of men and an incomparable organizer of the fruits of laborious weeks of grinding toil in the pulpit and the confessional. It is true that he labored incessantly and successfully for the Holy Rosary Confraternities, but his inclination and his sympathy led him to interest himself profoundly in the spiritual welfare of men. For them he had a charm and a force all his own. He knew the way to their hearts with unerring accuracy. Every mission increased his clientele of men who thenceforth lay in wait for him whenever his duties brought him again within their reach. Few priests in the United States had a larger circle of male penitents, to whom the good priest's occasional visits were like the oil of gladness and the balm of comfort.

In the Holy Name Society, of ancient origin, but previously little known in the United States, he found an instrument of extraordinary value for arousing the faith of vast congregations of men and moving them to an ardent love of the Crucified One and a tender reverence for His honor and glory. Its ranks have grown from year to year until it now represents many hundreds of thousands of devoted Catholic men committed to clean and wholesome lives before God, and potentially the best material of good citizenship. Our great cities have witnessed of recent years immense parades of the members of this association, and few public events have brought home so forcibly the development of Catholic life and temper amid populations once suspicious or hostile, now respectful and often sympathetic. In this work Father McKenna was simply tireless and rose often to the greatest heights of elo-

quence and to equally great levels of devotion and sacrifice. He recalls the figure of St. Bernardine of Sienna, with whom he has much in common, once the quest of souls is accepted as a norm of comparison.

Perhaps the best work of Father McKenna was not in the pulpit and the confessional, dear as they were to him, but in his own daily life as it fell under the observation of clergy and people. Dr. O'Daniel, summing up his qualities (p. 315) as a model priest and missionary, says rightly: "How the great missioner could touch the souls of all may be judged from the fact that pastors and the parochial clergy often found themselves almost unconsciously making the mission which they had engaged Father McKenna to give to their parishioners, convinced that they could not make a better retreat than by following the spiritual exercises he was giving their people. . . . Young priests in particular, for whom he had a special love and in whom he took a keen interest, profited by his example. Many of our most representative clergymen of today frankly confess that they owe their lofty ideals of the priesthood to contact with Father McKenna in the early days of their ministry." This humble priest, surely one of the holiest missionaries of modern times, had the secret of goodness and mercy, and gladly made it known to all men. Herein lay the source of his influence, that has by no means melted into the general void, but is yet active. He denounced sin in words of flame and was a moral portraitist of supreme skill and accuracy. But he loved every sinner with a Christian-like love, and in that love he entered the heart of every sinner and took possession of it in the name of Jesus. Of Father McKenna might well be written, as of the God-Man, *Pertransiit benefaciendo;* he shed charity and peace as an aroma. Whithersoever his calling took him he was always "vir bonus et rectus timens Dominum," and, like the Good Samaritan, rejoiced greatly to bind up the wounds of his weaker brethren and to provide for them every spiritual comfort. This world is immeasurably better for his apostolic life, and his white robe has surely added to the company of the elect a new radiance.

✠ Thomas J. Shahan.

Peter Sailly (1754-1826): A Pioneer Champion of the Champlain Valley, with extracts from his Diary and Letters, by George S. Bixby. New York State Library History Bulletin 12. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1919. Pp. 94.

Pierre, son of Frederick Maire, was born April 20, 1754, at the forges of Ste. Marie, in the old Lorraine province of France. He was educated for professional life, but turned to iron making. In this came misfortune for which he was not responsible. He therefore joined the considerable number of French immigrants of condition and character who were attracted to the United States after the peace of 1783 with Great Britain. With his new country he took a new name. As Peter Sailly he settled down with his family on land he purchased in 1785 near Plattsburg, New York. He died there March 16, 1826. For four decades he was a notable and influential figure in the social, commercial and political life of northern New York, as merchant, county judge, member of the legislature, representative in Congress, collector of customs and patron of all public improvements and institutions of education. "A man of exceptional force, of impressive personal appearance and manner, of unusual courage," and further says this biography: "Although reared a Roman Catholic he failed to set great store by ecclesiastical forms, and he was by no means a churchman. However, he never attached himself seriously to any other Church. He contributed liberally to the building of the Presbyterian Church in Plattsburg and owned a pew in it." He had seven children. It can be surmised what effect the Presbyterian pew had on their religious convictions and that his grandchildren are not among those prominent in the affairs of that local institution, the Plattsburg Catholic Summer School. A number of other French immigrants were attracted like Peter Sailly to northeastern New York towards the end of the eighteenth century. Many were men of means and education, but, under their auspices, the Church made neither transient nor permanent progress. Their neglect and indifference stand out in sharp contrast to the zeal of the poor Irish canal-diggers and railroad-builders who followed after them. They soon occupied pews in churches of their own. Their posterity have multiplied them all over the great state consecrated to the True Faith by the French blood of the martyr Jogues.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

The United States in the World War, by John Bach McMaster. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1918. Pp. 485.

The publication of this book is a pleasure to historians, but it is a pleasure commingled with some measure of incredulity and hesitancy. At first sight such work must seem to be too hurriedly written, too premature for a correct historical presentation. The events are too vital, too near to all to be viewed with fairness. These fears have some basis in the present work—they must have. Nevertheless, the joy it gives is real. The difficulties of such a task as the author sets himself to must be understood if justice be dealt. It has passed into a proverb that history is written a generation after the events. Prejudices and overpowering feelings, often frantic eagerness, scorch with flame a cold, logical judgment. This is true today as it has ever been. What truly sound evidence can be examined? Evidence we have unmeasured, but it does not entirely satisfy. Newspapers and magazines for current opinion, diplomatic publications for the statement of international relations. It is their business to be so, but, alas, are they? The learned professor of Pennsylvania realized all this and set to work to sift the false from the true, to give a clear, concise, impartial account of the War of Wars. The work is as true and just as it could be; it reflects historical acumen, and the reader will find it worthy of such an illustrious pen. There are too many publications instigated by bias or hate, and it is a relief for sane Americans to read the *United States in the World War*.

The author begins this history with June 29, 1914, and ends with the withdrawal of Russia and Roumania from the war. It is important to note that no military operations are treated. This is not surprising. Accuracy in military matters in war times is an anomaly. The author confines himself to relations between the warring nations and the United States—the antagonism to the war on the one hand and the patriotic ardor of the great majority on the other. Some idea of the work can be obtained if the chapter headings are recorded and something of their contents discussed. Under chapter 1, "The Opening of the World War," the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and the strained relations this event caused between Serbia and Austria are narrated. In rapid succession, but with concision, the entrance of Germany, France, Russia, Belgium, and England are

treated, the author quoting from the Russian Orange Book No. 4, the British Blue Paper No. 2, the French Yellow Book No. 39, and the Austrian Red Book No. 20. "Pro-German Propaganda-Belgium Relief," chapter 2, explains itself, but it is striking to note that there is no mention of pro-Ally propaganda. Such, it would seem, ought to be considered. Its existence is unquestionable. Such an omission may be condoned, but a treatment of it by McMaster would be illuminating.

In chaper 3, the difficult question of neutral trade is treated at length: "Trade between neutral nations in neutral bottoms was now no longer regarded as presumably innocent; the final destination of the cargo determined its innocence; the accepted list of contraband articles was grealty extended, and our vessels, seized on the high seas, were taken into ports for examination and often detained for weeks before they were released," by the British Navy. Particular cases and the necessary communication with Great Britain which grew out of them are treated at length. The right of Great Britain to visit and search American or neutral vessels was conceded, but the United States could not permit, without protest, American ships or cargoes to be taken into British ports, there to search for evidence of contraband. The consequence of the interference with our ships and our mail, and the peaceful ending, hold the attention of the reader by their thoroughness. Passing over the chapters, "Submarine Frightfulness," "Lusitania Notes," an "Embargo Demanded," chapters teeming with interest, let us note chapter 7, "Treacherous Acts of German Officials." Under this heading the aiding of German cruisers by false clearance papers of vessels, placing bombs in allied ships, procuring passports for German reservists and the work of Franz von Papen, Werner Horn, Captain Boy-Ed, Von Bernstorff, the work of the ubiquitous, illusive *Providence Journal* are sketched, not only here but especially here. The interest is centered around the aforesaid journal, and perhaps there is a haze which is not lifted. The prudent who favor a tardy assent are not satisfied. The statement of its work is clear enough, but we feel that something is lacking.

In the chapter, "Sinking without Warning," the contrary reports of allied and Germanic sources are clearly set forth with reference to the liner *Arabic*. The German note delivered by

Bernstorff to the Secretary of State declared that a submarine on August 19, 1915, stopped the British liner *Dunsley* south of Kinsale, intending to sink her by gun fire, when the steamer *Arabic* appeared, having neither flag nor neutral markings, altered her course and steamed towards the subsea boat with the intention of ramming it. The British officers on the *Arabic* declared that the *Arabic* did not intend to ram the U-boat. Similar conditions existed in the *Ancona* case and many others. The author also treats under separate headings, "Preparedness and Pacifists," "Plots and Crimes on Sea and on Land," "The Peace Notes," "Diplomatic Relations," "We Enter the War," "The Call to the Colors," "German Intrigue," "Rationing and Fighting," and the "International Peace Debate."

The presentation of the author is precise and concise, but at times it becomes tedious. This effect possibly follows from his concision and the number of current sources quoted, but this defect is a blur, not a blotch. His arrangment of facts, as far as temporal propinquity will admit, is noteworthy. The variant sources are placed side by side, and the reader is enticed to decide. Accurate decision in all cases is out of the question. Time alone will tell, but the opinion of legislators, and that of the great majority of the people, settle the matter for the present.

Despite the lack of treatment of the effect of the pro-Ally propaganda, which is of much interest and importance in its purpose and consequence and result, despite the fact that the book is at times hard to peruse, it is of value to educated Americans. It was written by a student of history, not by a zealous apologist, and it breathes a candor that does honor to the learned writer. He has labored to present a summary of those intricate international relations that others have accumulated slowly and with a hazard at the truth. It is concise, as accurate as possible, and well worth the reading.

WILLIAM LENNARTZ, C.S.C., LITT.D.

America among the Nations, by H. H. Powers. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918. Pp. 376.

This book was first published in the latter part of 1917, when the world was in the midst of war and when the problems of nationalities, boundaries, policies, and similar questions were

being discussed by political philosophers and others in pamphlet, newspaper, magazine, and book, without regard for the existing shortage of paper. The author describes his effort as an "attempt at an historical interpretation of our national character and our relation to other nations." He would discard "the time-honoured formulas and arrive at an independent estimate of national character from the homely facts of our national history;" and likewise disregard the "prepossessions and epithets which have too long done duty with us as estimates of foreign nations, and arrive at a juster conclusion based on their action."

The work is divided into two parts, the first reviewing the history of America at home, the second treating of its relations with other nations. The second part contains too little history and too much prophecy (I was about to say "propaganda") to receive attention in an historical journal. We may approve or disapprove of his boundless admiration for the Greatest Empire; we may agree or disagree with his statement that upon the absolute control of Ireland depends the very existence of that empire, and that "not the British Parliament but the maker of the planet decreed the dependence of Ireland;" but in spite of the efforts made nowadays by many historians to rewrite the relations with Great Britain, it scarcely seems possible that historical students are yet ready to go so far as this author. "The relation between the two countries," he says, "has never been one of serious hostility, nor has our membership in the Anglo-Saxon fellowship (which is the substance of the British Empire) ever been cancelled. We have become independent, but so have Canada and Australia. . . . We have fought for our independence—and for theirs—and Britain fought for it too, fought with us against a king who acted without her warrant and against a theory of government that she had repudiated with the sword a century before. . . . She has stood by us from the first, and in every crisis of our history she has tipped the scale in our favor."

Much of the latter part of the volume is concerned with the international problems of the war and of the peace, which had not been determined when the book was written (and this later reprint differs not at all from the first). This is no longer timely and need not be discussed. The results have shown the fallacy of much of his prophecy in this connection.

The author in reviewing the history of the nation, in tracing its development to its present power and position, has indeed broken away from the long-traded paths and shows us a land that is more or less unfamiliar—and not very pleasing if we use his glasses. The period of colonization is presented in a natural, connected manner in a style characteristic of the book thoughout, fresh and attractive. With conditions as they were bound to be, on account of the isolation of the colonies, physical separation from the mother country was inevitable. Then began a century of unparalleled territorial expansion and conquest. First it was that part of Florida involved in the secret clause of the treaty with Great Britain. Since Spain denied our right and yielded to a threat of force, this was conquest; and our Constitution was then but six years old. At the ripe age of fifteen the nation further showed its imperialistic sentiment by purchasing stolen goods from Napoleon. Next it was West Florida that we took, then the Florida of our own day, the seizing of which was disguised under the form of purchase, a policy "peculiarly American." With the southeastern corner of our continent properly rounded out, our restless energies turned to the northeast, where we established an unenviable record in the history of arbitration in ignoring the award of the arbiter. The author is not impressed with the moderation of American demands in this first period of our history. "We want the earth, and we say so frankly. . . . Our method of procedure is equally characteristic, to ask for what we want—for all of it—and stand our ground. Recognizing that possession is nine points in law, we have shown a strong inclination to make appropriation our first step in the proceedings, whether we contemplated purchase or conquest. We have also appreciated the value of a threat of war at the proper moment."

In the same tone the struggle for the Pacific is described. If we wanted a natural stopping place the Rocky Mountains was the place to stop. "But the American people have not been looking for stopping places. For them all stopping places have been starting places, and that forthwith." And so Oregon was secured (the Whitman myth is preserved), although England had a prior right since her explorers had come earlier and gone farther.

In a chapter entitled, "Despoiling the Latin," the annexation of Texas and the forfeit exacted of Mexico are put down as natural

outcroppings of our militant and imperialistic nature. This whole territory had begun to attract American settlers. "That is tantamount to saying that we had begun to desire the land." Yet the author holds the annexation of Texas the most irreproachable episode in our long record of imperialism; nor does he share the popular opinion regarding our war with Mexico. The Gadsden purchase was another transaction of doubtful satisfaction, but here we were the victims of our own ignorance and cupidity in losing control of the Gulf of California.

The purchase of Alaska was a break with tradition, but at that time we trusted to a future annexation of Canada to reëstablish our doctrine of continuous territory. Our war with Spain was one of the best justified of all our wars, and, in the mind of the author, there was more reason for our imperialistic tendencies in the Philippines, Porto Rico, San Domingo, and Cuba than on our own continent. Finally, further expansion in the Caribbean Sea is prophesied by reason of our situation on the Canal. If our nation is "the offspring and heir of New England" and is "still Puritan in a substantial degree," as the author maintains, this story of a greedy people dishonestly grabbing land on all sides, if true, shows the heir to have wandered far from the path of Puritanic rectitude.

It is evident very early in the volume that the author has not disregarded "the prepossessions and epithets which have too long done duty," in his explanation of the religious element that entered into the conflict for America. "When the great competition began," he says (p. 21), "England and France were in revolt against the intellectual bondage of Roman Catholicism, while Spain was intensely loyal. . . . Coligny and the Protestant cause had perished at St. Bartholomew's, and with them their ill-starred colonial schemes. Colonies fostered by state aid, under the supervision of the Church, and soon under the direction of the Jesuits, supplied abundant and mutual justification for a relentless war against the tenacious heresies of colonies even more heretical than the heretical land from which they came." Now with the English colonies it was different. "Many of them had intense convictions and were exceedingly jealous of all dissenting opinion within their midst. But the notion of forcing other colonies to their own opinion does not seem to have been entertained. . . .

Whatever may be said for the French, the English did not fight these wars in the interest of religious propaganda."

The book contains no footnotes, "as the historic facts referred to are for the most part commonplaces." So the ignorant reader is not enlightened as to the dates and circumstances of the relentless war waged by the Jesuits and the Church in America for religion's sake. It is this lack of authorities, as well as the speculative nature of the greater part of the contents, that makes this book only an interesting but ephemeral interpretation.

LEO STOCK, A.M.

Life of Henry Barnard, the First United States Commissioner of Education, 1867-70, by Bernard C. Steiner. Bulletin 1919, No. 8, Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior.

For those interested in the History of Education in America few careers are more fascinating than those of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard. They were the first American apostles of democracy in education and in more than one sense martyrs in the cause. Both labored to bring the blessings of education to all that the country, as Barnard said, might have "schools good enough for the best and cheap enough for the poorest." As Mann's career forms the first chapter in the history of organized education in Massachusetts, so Barnard's makes up the beginnings of educational system in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

This life, published as a bulletin of the United States Bureau of Education, will make its strongest appeal to educational administrators, executives and those interested in the development of organized education in New England. The preparation for and the determination of Barnard's life work are well described in the account of his education, teaching experience, travel, and term as a member of the Connecticut legislature. In separate chapters on his work as Secretary of the Board of Commissioners of the Common Schools of Connecticut, State Superintendent of Schools of Rhode Island and State Superintendent of Education in Connecticut his varied experiences as an executive are succinctly told. Other chapters describe his editorship and management of the *American Journal of Education*, presidency of St. John's, Annapolis, term as the first United States Commissioner of Education,

and his last years. All this has been accomplished within 131 pages, and it must be said, in tribute to the author's fine taste and skill, with touches of sympathy for the subject that make it a most readable and satisfying book.

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK, PH.D.

California: A history of Upper and Lower California from their first discovery to the present time, comprising an account of the climate, soil, natural production, agriculture, commerce, etc.; a full view of the missionary establishments and condition of the free and domesticated Indians. With an appendix relating to steam navigation in the Pacific. Illustrated with a new map, plans of the harbors, and numerous engravings. By Alexander Forbes, Esq. (London, 1839). Reprinted page for page, and approximately line for line, from the original edition. . . . to which is added a new index. San Francisco: Thomas C. Russell, 1919. Pp. 372. Price, $7.50.

Forbes's *History* is important in the list of *Californiana* for two especial reasons. It is the first English book relating wholly to California, and it presents a foreigner's estimate of the old Spanish colony and Mexican province as it was just before the period of the American immigration. It might be added that it is of prime interest as a faithful record of the attitude of a son of England toward California in those and ensuing days when that country, as well as France and the United States, were each communing with the thought, "It is a goodly land; let us go over and possess it."

The body of the text was written, or rather completed, in Mexico and sent to England for publication in 1835. The printing was delayed for three years, and it is due to that circumstance that the author was able to send to his brother the editor additional materials bearing upon the international interest in California after the temporary separation from Mexico in 1836 and upon the projected beginnings of steam navigation as a mode of bringing the fringe of the world nearer to the seats of power in Europe. The emphasis being on those topics, the historical narrative of earlier times is not so valuable as the contemporary material, though indeed there are few better histories of California, considering the availability of the materials for historical

writing at the time, or even the use made of later materials by numerous authors in the same field.

The section relating to Lower California is taken perforce almost entirely from the Venegas *Noticia de la California*, which was written about a century before Forbes underook his work. This necessarily sympathetic recital of the early conquest and conversion of the Peninsular Indians is followed by one of the most complete and interesting accounts in existence of the pearl fisheries of the Gulf, gathered from information given by Alexander von Humboldt and a number of later authorities, most of whom were English sea-captains.

The account of the spiritual conquest of Upper California is, of course, taken from the *Noticias de la Nueva California* by Father Palou, while the description of the topography of the country is based on the manuscript records of those staunch old Franciscan explorers, Fathers Garcés, Font, Domínguez, and Vélez de Escalante. The purpose of the author in using them is naively set forth in the following words: "The journeys of these friars are chiefly valuable in as far as they prove that there is nothing in the character of the Indian population of the country lying between the people, Mexican states and California, which can prevent its being easily colonized, or which could prevent a free communication overland; neither is the distance at all formidable. It is also proved by them that the whole of this vast country is free from any natural obstruction to its settlement and cultivation. There are no impenetrable forests, and the greater part of it is a level country, full of pasturage, and capable of being cultivated" (p. 160).

The author's opinion regarding the character and quality of the spiritual conquest is not wholly censorious. "From the feeble and mild physical and moral characters of the natives. . . . the success of the missionaries . . . is . . . very easily understood. . . . Had they been set down among . . . the fierce races . . . they never would have succeeded in . . . domesticating them, but could have been destroyed or driven from the country" (p. 199). " . . . However . . . there are few events in history more remarkable, on the whole, or more interesting, than the transformation on the great scale wrought by the Jesuits and Franciscans in Paraguay and California" (p. 200). After point-

ing out certain defects of the mission system, Forbes goes on: "And yet I have never heard that the missionaries of California have not acted with the most perfect fidelity, or that they have ever betrayed their trust or exercised inhumanity, and the testimony of all travelers who have visited this country is uniformly to the same effect. On the contrary, there are recorded instances of the most extraordinary zeal, industry, and philanthropy in the conduct of those men. . . ." [notably Father Péyri] (p. 227 *ff*).

Nevertheless, since he found the savage reduced from barbarism "only to be plunged in another sort of barbarism and an aggravated sort of misery" (p. 233), "all that we can allow is, that the missionaries are honest men; that they pursue with assiduity what they believe to be their duty; that they labor in their vocation with zeal. But we entirely condemn their system, and lament its results." After bewailing in general the missionary work of civilization, he goes on: "I do not despair that the time will come when . . . prudent men will be sent among the heathens, carrying with them Bibles and tracts certainly, but also agricultural and manufacturing implements, useful mechanical inventions, furniture, and clothing, with instructions to reclaim the savage not merely by the terror of future punishments, but likewise by the fascination of a more comfortable worldy existence" (pp. 237-8). That is to say, Forbes could live for years alongside the missions and see them at work without realizing that they had always been doing just the things he advocated. His criticism is an injustice born of faulty observation. Equally beside the mark, too, is his doleful picture of the missionary work of the "spare, sour, ascetic Methodist, who takes from his followers all their pastimes and pleasures" (p. 245). The obvious fact is that the author was a merchant, a successful business man, a dispassionate thinker and fairly reasonable, but by the same mark no judge of missionary activities, which he might have become had he given a little closer attention to the results of the labors of the great missionary pioneers who have borne their honorable part in carrying the amenities of civilization and the blessings of religion whither the merchant with bundle and stick has been ever glad to penetrate in their wake.

The first foreign account of the separation of California from Mexico in 1836 is briefly used as the text for the advice that it

was not from the Russians, whom the British believed to have designs on California, but from the on-sweeping settlers from the United States, that the next political move was to be expected. Forbes, of course, hoped that California would be taken by the English to cancel the Mexican debt of over fifty million dollars, the creditors to be organized on the plan of the East India Company.

The picture of the agriculture, commerce, and navigation in the primitive state of those occupations in the old Mexican California lead quite naturally to the topic of the author's greatest interest, California as a field for foreign colonization. The natural advantages of geographical situation, topographical relations, fertile soil, superb ports, abundant rivers, equable climate, and proximity to world markets are set forth as they have been so often by the hosts of "boosters" of these latter days. The Isthmian railway and the canal are forecast with an optimism tempered by the opinion "that all attempts to make a passage between the two oceans will be abortive unless the territory through which the canal passes shall be ceded in sovereignty to some powerful European state or put under the guaranty of a convention of European states," because the Spanish-American republics lack the stability and the liberality indispensable for the success of such an undertaking (p. 317).

California was for the moment an unpromising field for colonization because of the uncertainty of its political relations and the anarchy due to separation from Mexico. However, the few foreigners who had come had always found a welcome, particularly from the missionaries. Forbes recommended a compact foreign colony which should take a strong position in the Sacramento Valley, away from the missions and the towns, so as to avoid local complications; all this presupposing a more liberal policy on the part of the Mexican government.

While the book was a very ostensible piece of propaganda, it was ably and carefully written, in dignfied and thoroughly readable style unusually free from historical inaccuracies, offensive characterizations, or indefensible attitudes.

The author was one of the founders of the English house of Barron, Forbes and Company, wholesale merchants of Tepic, Mexico. Previously he had been in business in Buenos Aires

He was one of the early owners of the New Almaden quicksilver mine in the present Santa Clara County, California. He is well known in local annals as one of the few foreigners who laid the basis of their fortunes in the old California of the days before the gold rush. His book has become a rare item much sought for by collectors; a copy of the original edition recently brought $150.00, though the current price is about one-third that figure.

The publisher, therefore, performs a valuable service to lovers of Californiana by issuing this reprint. He has also done this in the case of the scarce *Narrative of Edward McGowan*, and has in hand a like project for the reproduction of the diary of the Antonio Maurelle voyage on the California coasts.

In each of these publications Mr. Russell has made page-for-page or even line-for-line reproductions. He performs the work in all stages with his own hands, and, being an old book-publisher with definite ideas as to style and form, he has dressed the old favorites in new and more attractive garb which pleases the eye and satisfies the lover of book perfection. Typographical and editorial mistakes in the originals are corrected, and varying usages are harmonized. The principles upon which the corrections are based are shown in prefatory pages.

The illustrations of Forbes, taken from the original imprint have, in a limited number of the edition, been hand-tinted. The publisher has added a valuable index.

HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY, PH.D.

The Book of Philadelphia, by Robert Shackleton, author of *The Book of Boston, The Book of New York, Unvisited Places of Old Europe, etc.* Illustrated with photographs and drawings by R. L. Boyer and Herbert Pullinger. Philadelphia: The Penn Publishing Company, 1918. Pp. 420, 8vo.

"The typical Philadelphian," says our author (p. 195), "is likely to feel a fine sense of certainty. One of the historical writers of the city—there are several, so it may be any one of them—was telling me of a work on which he was engaged which was to cover a period which, as I knew, is notable for the conflict of authorities. I made some obvious remark regarding the difficulties he had set himself to surmount; but he only replied, calmly: 'There will be no

difficulties. I shall merely write it all just as it was'; than which the Recording Angel could say no more."

This anecdote is quoted here partly for its humor, partly for its moral. It is not to be taken as a characteristic illustration of the author's English style, for there are, of course, too many close repetitions of *which* to suit a fastidious taste; and otherwise the style of the volume is quite satisfactory, while its content is always most entertaining. The book is altogether charming, both in its letterpress and in its diversified pictorial illustrations. Better still, it is highly informative from many standpoints—literary, artistic and social, as well as historical. Perhaps best of all, it is not "just another book" with an intensely local flavor and atmosphere that would naturally appeal mostly—indeed, only—to the denizens of the city glorified in its pages. It presents to its readers all the inner charm and much of the outward phenomena of the City of Brotherly Love, it is true, but constantly bids them contemplate broader national—and even international—horizons; and the readers begin to see Philadelphia in its historical and artistic and literary setting. The volume should accordingly prove most interesting to all Americans. In furnishing for one local fact an attractive setting of a dozen national or international facts, the volume happily illustrates (if we may slightly alter a poet's line) "that pleasure in historic pains historians only know"; for the chief zest in historic research may lie in the discovery of a dozen unexpected things amid the long porings and borings for a single fact.

But to return to our sheep. The anecdote has humor "not only," but a moral as well. There are indeed many historical writers in Penn's Green Town, and not a few of them have been engaged, in recent years, upon the congenial task of writing or compiling (a real distinction is intended by the disjunction) books about Philadelphia. From their custom of not furnishing references to authorities for statements some of which are historically of a contentious character, "any one of them" (if we may repeat our author's phrase) might seem to fit into the anecdote. They might easily be conceived of as saying in substance, after their several fashions: "There will be no difficulties. I shall merely write it all just as it was." An obvious explanation of this "fine sense of certainty" is found in the popular character of their vol-

umes. Mayhap, also, there was an equally delicate sense of modesty in learning that shrank from a parading of authorities.

Howbeit, our author has a proper bone to pick with one of them. Macaulay's schoolboy would, of course, know that Philadelphia has two "Halls" most famous in American history, namely, Carpenters' Hall (where the work of Independence was begun in 1774) and "Independence Hall" (as the old State House is now commonly called, wherein the work of Independence was completed). But the notable schoolboy is a rare bird today "Before me," says our author (p. 83), "is a book containing an account of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, published in the year 1876, the year of the Centennial, when every detail and incident and locality bearing upon Philadelphia and the Revolution was discussed and rediscussed, and was supposedly in the minds of all Philadelphians and visitors and a great mass of the population of the United States. For 1876 was a year that drew marvelous attention to Philadelphia and aroused and awakened the keenest interest of Philadelphians themselves. The book bears the name of one R. M. Devons, described on the title page as 'Member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.' And in the last paragraph of the description of the signing are the words: 'Carpenters' Hall—or Independence Hall—in Philadelphia, where the tremendous scenes transpired, is still one of the places which every American looks upon with patriotic pride'; as if the two buildings were one and the same!" To our author's criticism of the unfortunate *lapsus* that confounded two highly historic halls might be added a criticism of the word *transpired*. The deliberations of the First Continental Congress in Carpenters' Hall were secret. The "tremendous scenes" referred to occurred there, but transpired later.

In noting the *lapsus* of the Centennial historian, our author gently prepares us for a kindly judgment upon it by previously noting that, because of its nearly hidden location at present, Carpenters' Hall "has become a building overlooked, disregarded, a building almost mythical, even though it actually stands here in fascinating actuality ['actually stands . . . in . . . actuality'—the reviewer again protests that his quotations must not be taken as illustrative of the style of our author]. I should think that three-quarters, or even more, of the inhabitants of Philadelphia

do not know that such a building is honorably preserved; and the number of those who would be able to walk directly to the spot is quite negligible" (p. 83).

Apropos of our present inability (due to ignorance, not to geographical or other barriers) "to walk directly to the spot" of Carpenters' Hall, our author notes that the members of the Congress met first of all tentatively in the City Tavern—the Bellevue-Stratford of that time—and then "they all walked, by twos and threes, in general friendly companionship, along the narrow brick sidewalks, the short distance from the tavern to Carpenters' Hall. . . It was but a few minutes' walk; it was a walk of the briefest; but it was the most interesting walk in American history" (p. 86). A striking observation, and doubtless a true one, albeit involving the always dangerous superlative degree. We may compare or correlate it with a similar remark that occurs many pages further on: "As to walking on Chestnut Street—it is not likely that there will ever be anything more important, more impressive, than the march of the Continentals along this street, led by Washington, on their way to the battlefield of Brandywine; ragged, ill-shod, ill-clothed, ill-fed, they marched bravely on, with drumming and fifing, and each with a green twig in his hat" (p. 144).

Our author's inclusions are generously broadminded. The chapter on "The Hidden Churches" deals with the old and historic churches noted in every book on Philadelphia—Christ Church, with its "low spire that is hidden"; and St. Peter's with its "tall spire that is hidden"; and Old Swedes, with "no spire at all," and therefore still more hidden. "And when it comes to St. Joseph's—but that," says our author, "is still another story"; and Old St. Joseph's has a chapter devoted to it alone (with mention, however, of the old Catholic church of Holy Trinity), under the heading: "Within a Nooked Courtyard." The account is interesting. In the course of it, we are told that Longfellow's Evangeline "impressed herself locally far more deeply than have most of the actual distinguished folk of Philadelphia. She is more real than if she were really real! In fact, the story of Evangeline is taken with an amazing reality" (p. 37). The statue of Commodore Barry, too, comes in for honorable mention in the admirable description of the State House: "A vigorous statue, placed with peculiar prominence opposite the Independence Square face

of the State House is of Barry, a naval officer of the Revolution, a Philadelphian [but a native of Ireland]. He is buried in the Catholic St. Mary's, on Fourth Street" (p. 75).

One is pleasantly impressed, too, on finding some importance attached to the significant manner in which "Charles Carroll of Carrollton" affixed his name to the Declaration of Independence: "Most of the members formally signed this supposed Fourth of July document on August the second, but a few did not put down their names until still later. . . .'Charles Carroll of Carrollton,' who signed thus lengthily so that, as he expressed it, King George should know which Charles Carroll it was, was one who, like part of the Pennsylvania delegation, was a member on August 2 but not on the momentous July 4. It meant something, too, Carroll's saying this, for it is said that he added 'of Carrollton' because of the jeer of some member that there were so many Carrolls that he might be safe! He was believed to be the wealthiest man in the Colonies. His property at the beginning of the Revolution was estimated at two million dollars. All this he risked; yet he lived until 1832, to the age of 95, the last to survive of all the Signers" (p. 66).

By way of contrast with this exaltation of Carroll, Jefferson comes in for implicit denunciation (p. 68). "Where is Jefferson?" wrote Washington from Valley Forge: "The long, slim statesman is very prominent in Trumbull's picture, and was so in reality; but during the terrible days of Valley Forge, although then only about thirty-five years old, he was not in the army! His words had got other men in! Nor was he even with Congress. He had recently resigned, when strong men were desperately needed there, and had given his private concerns as excuse! He was rich, with a huge estate. He entered the state legislature, and before the war was over became Governor of Virginia. After all, North and South were alike; Hancock and Samuel Adams galloping in mad fear away from the coming fight at Lexington, and Jefferson shrinking from Valley Forge. If one chose to be cynical, he might remark that a successful statesman is a man who gets others to fight and then keeps away from the fighting" (p. 68).

The pages of this delightful volume are made very interesting by a profusion of appropriate anecdotes and witty sayings. Benjamin Franklin looms large throughout, of course, and is made the

center of many a happy reference to other great men, native and foreign. Towards the close of his life, for instance, he housed a printing-press (in a rude building on what is now Orianna Street) partly perhaps for his own pastime, but mostly in the interest of his grandson, Benjamin Franklin Bache, who subsequently turned it over to Duane. And "there arrived one day, looking for work, a young man from Ireland, named James Wilson; not James Wilson, the Signer, who is buried at Christ Church, but one who through a descendant won far greater fame. And at the press that Franklin had left, in the little printing shop he had built, there went to work this young Irishman, who shortly afterward married a Scotch-Irish girl who had crossed the ocean on the same ship with him; and a grandson of these two is Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States" (p. 44). "To add smaller things to great it may be mentioned it was in this now so dingy Orianna Street that the elder James Gordon Bennett began his printing career" (p. 44). Franklin built himself "a house of individuality," fireproofed and spacious, and furnished it with elegance. During the British occupancy of the city, Major André was billeted there and (so wrote Mrs. Bache to Franklin) took away with him a portrait of Franklin himself. "Major-General Grey . . . was likewise billeted at the Franklin home, and it is said that he, too, went off with a portrait, which long afterwards was sent back to the Franklin family by one of the general's descendants" (p. 46).

Our author is to be congratulated on a successful attempt to make outsiders love the green city of Penn and to understand its prime characteristics. There is not a "dry" page in the book. Philadelphia "shows lovable aspects to strangers" (p. 404). To Thackeray, it was "grave, calm, kind, old Philadelphia." To John Adams, it was "the happy, the peaceful, the elegant, the hospitable, and polite city of Philadelphia."

H. T. Henry, Litt.D.

The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina. By Chauncey Samuel Boucher, Ph.D. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 399, including maps, bibliography, and index. 1918.

This work treats of the development and culmination of Nullification in South Carolina, but it does not examine any of

the earlier disputes concerning the location of the sovereignty. The narrative, which is clear and concise, brings the story of the agitation down to 1840, when the controversy which had shaken the foundations of the Union appeared to have sunk to rest. Perhaps it would have added to the value of his book if the author had included even a brief examination of the discussion of sovereignty in Tucker's Blackstone, the dissenting opinion of Justice Iredell in Chisholm *versus* Georgia, the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, the Hartford Convention, and certain other kindred ordinances, works and assemblies.

The reader of this excellent volume has one more proof, if any additional evidence is needed, that American statesmen in dealing with preachers of sedition have always erred on the side of generosity. In our own troubled era the Federal Government is hardly more resolute in its treatment of disloyal citizens. The past history of our country appears to have made it plain to those inclined to treasonable acts that they may with impunity commit the gravest crimes against this Republic. All traces of this idea should be ruthlessly effaced.

Doctor Boucher accurately describes the successive steps by which agitators, vagabonds, and, if one chooses so to call them, patriots, arranged the collision of the two doctrines of constitutional interpretation. If, as Burke says, "men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites," there were in South Carolina multitudes unfit to enjoy the blessings which they possessed within the Union. This was never fully appreciated by the restless generation of agitators in the Palmetto State until the legions of Sherman left behind them the ruins of stately cities, blackened memorials of Southern defeat and disaster. Ink is still being wasted in the effort to fix the responsibility for their fate. Propagandists sufficiently adroit seldom fail, if their endeavors are prolonged, to excite a people to a pitch of frenzy. A madman takes no note of the resources of his adversary and cares to take none. Of the accuracy of this statement history is full of proofs.

Those who are familiar with the conspicuous landmarks of Nullification would do well to see in the pages of this book the progress and development of that agitation; also the extent of the patriotic and intelligent opposition within South Carolina itself.

Perhaps the general reader believes that there was in 1832 perfect unanimity in that commonwealth as there actually was in December, 1860. It is only by reading such monographs as the present that one's general opinions acquire a solid foundation.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY, Ph. D.

A History of American Journalism. By James Melvin Lee. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1917. Price, $3.50.

A comprehensive history of American journalism has as yet not been published that gives in detail the trials and vicissitudes, the successes and failures, the literary elegance and the idiosyncrasies of the nation's journalistic celebrities. Nor does this book present an exhaustive treatment of the subject. The purpose and scope of the work seems to be to give certain general aspects of American journalism with a particular emphasis regarding the beginnings; but no general effort has been made to determine the editorial policies in a scientific way that might be useful to the student of journalism. The author does not show that deep analytical power which would compel the attention and interest of the philosopher of history.

The introductory chapters, which relate the modes of communication of the ancients, might very reasonably be omitted, and in its place might be substituted a clear definition of what constitutes the field of American journalism. No sufficient reason is apparent for the author's failure to treat weekly, monthly and quarterly periodicals. Is not the magazine and the review as much within the sphere of the journalist as the daily newspaper?

One would expect also that some attention would be bestowed on the religious press in this country, for we know that no opportunity for expression of opinion was lost by the diurnals, when questions of grave moment, affecting church and state, engaged the public mind. For instance, the spirit of the early press in New England, at least, cannot be properly understood without a summary or panoramic view of the strong counteracting influences, political, national and religious, always at war with that ascendancy.

In the formative period of our country's history, when immigration from almost every land was being woven into the warp and woof of this republic, there were also many disturbing elements at work, endeavoring to tear asunder the fabric from which our nation was being formed. The Puritanical Federalists early attempted to abridge the rights and liberties of certain peoples of foreign birth. The obnoxious Alien and Sedition Laws were the special instruments used to smother the freedom of the press. We have not even a mention of Matthew Lyon of Vermont, who was the first Irishman to suffer under the Sedition Law. He was later elected to Congress and had the satisfaction of casting the deciding vote which defeated Adams for re-election. This attempt of the President to muzzle the opposition press was one of the chief causes for the downfall of the Federalist party. With the rise of Jeffersonian democracy many restraints were removed, but in their place arose a propagandist press which endeavored to persecute, by every species of vituperation that human ingenuity could devise, these exiles from European tyranny and autocracy. In this propaganda English agents played no small part, especially against their traditional opponents, the United Irishmen.

To meet this virulence and invective, and to nail every violation of the truth and distortion of fact, the Irish newspapers were begun in some of the principal cities of the United States. These journals, while they waged war for the protection of their liberties, were at the same time a force and a power in the great work of Americanization of immigrants. For this reason, and on account of the influence they had in the neutralization of existing prejudices, they must claim some attention by the historian of American journalism.

The difficulty in selection of interesting, valuable and relevant facts on the history of American journalism; the inaccessibility and the dearth of original source; the inaccuracies of much of the supplementary materials, dealing chiefly with persons and circumstances, make the work of the historian a monumental task. The author has done well to express, within the contents of one volume of moderate size, the salient features of American journalistic achievement. The plan of dividing the book into periods is admirably executed, and therefore convenient for

reference. The chief regret of the critical student of history is that the text is not accompanied by authorities consulted; nor is there a bibliographical reference of any kind to encourage further research in some of the more particular aspects of journalism.

PAUL J. FOIK, C.S.C., PH.D.

A Glory of Maryland. By M. S. Pine, Philadelphia, Pa.: Salesian Press, Don Bosco Institute, 1917. Price, $1.00.

This is really quite an interesting and attractive booklet. It is a metrical account of the life and labors of the Most Reverend Leonard Neale, D.D., the second Archbishop of Baltimore, the authoress' real name being Sister Mary Paulina. The historical notes at the end are themselves worth the price, not to mention the numerous illustrations containing some rare old prints. It is a labor of love on the part of the writer, inasmuch as Archbishop Neale was instrumental in establishing the Visitation Nuns in the United States. But anyone interested in the early history of the church in the United States will find the book well worth reading, as the notes are full of much interesting information upon that subject, especially information of a biographical character. The greater activity of Archbishop Neale's immediate predecessor in the see of Baltimore, Archbishop Carroll, has perhaps unduly relegated the memory of Neale to the obscure background. Yet the latter did leave the impress of his work upon the rising church, and it is precisely this which the author brings out with due emphasis. The book may serve a good purpose in inducing American-Catholic laymen to read somewhat of the early history of their church, a subject upon which at present they are unfortunately and densely ignorant.

LUCIEN JOHNSTON, S.T.L.

Centennial History of Illinois. Volume III; The Era of the Civil War: 1848–1870, by Arthur Charles Cole. The Illinois Centennial Commission, Springfield, Ill., 1919.

"The Catholic Church was gaining steadily in the larger cities from the heavy immigration of Irish and foreign Catholics. The Right Reverend James Oliver Van de Velde was installed as suc-

cessor to Bishop William Quarter as bishop of Chicago in 1848, but gave way five years later to Bishop O'Reagan; neither of these, however, aroused the enthusiastic cooperation of the clergy or laity. The See of Quincy was established in 1852, followed in 1857 by the erection of the episcopate of Alton. At the close of the decade the Catholics established the *Western Banner* as their organ at Chicago" (p. 248).

"The Catholics made progress in spite of the contentions that developed under the late years of Bishop Duggan's administration. Over one-half of the population of Chicago was Catholic; yet this included almost entirely persons of foreign birth or parentage, since the increase was largely the result of immigration. One of the problems of the Church was to Americanize the congregations; the Irish, however, often objected to the assignment of a priest who was not himself an Irishman."

"The Catholics labored not only under the difficulty of internal heterogeneity but also of external criticism. In 1867, considerable anti-Catholic feeling developed in Illinois when the Reverend J. G. White of Jacksonville, a fearless champion of Protestantism, went about the state lecturing on 'Romanism'" (pp. 425-6).

This is the rather meager account of Catholic growth and progress in Illinois—except for a detailed statement of Father Chiniquy's case—as given by the author of the above volume for the two decades under consideration. Compared with the space he devotes to other religious bodies, it scarcely does justice to the numerical strength of Catholics, their unobtrusive zeal, the institutions of learning and charity they founded. Nor is it even accurate.

Bishop Van de Velde was consecrated bishop of Chicago in St. Francis Xavier's church, St. Louis, February 11, 1849, and installed in his see the first of April of the same year. His successor was Bishop O'Regan (not O'Reagan). The diocese of Quincy was created July 29, 1853, but when the see was transferred to Alton, January 9, 1857, the diocese of Quincy ceased to exist. Bishop O'Regan's administration met with severe complaint on the part of some of his clergy, in consequence of which he resigned.

As for his successor, Bishop Duggan, his refinement and gentleness, his ease and grace of manner, made him socially very

popular, while his public spirit was much appreciated by the community at large. "The contentions that developed under the later years of his administration," confined as they were to the University of St. Mary of the Lake, were of very small consequence, and due to the first symptoms of that mental aberration to which the bishop fell a victim soon afterwards.

Perhaps all these are minor matters, but accuracy of dates and facts, in this case easily ascertainable, is expected even in a popular narrative of history.

For the rest, the author covers the ground quite thoroughly and succeeds in throwing some interesting sidelights on men and conditions of the times. Newspapers of the day have been very largely laid under contribution. Yet it is questionable whether every tenth rate sheet represents a current of public opinion worth chronicling. Newspapers, of course, are supposed to reflect the mind of the people. All too often they set forth only the warped and biased views of some influential individual or organization who, for reasons of their own, deem it well to keep in the background. Or they give vent to hastily conceived, ill-digested, violently expressed opinions that are unceremoniously reversed the next day. Vile and coarse epithets at the address of public men readily found their way into print towards the middle of the last century. Seldom was all this so apparent as in the case of Abraham Lincoln. Almost every refined and vulgar epithet had been hurled at him. Very few there were to credit him with any wisdom or any far-sighted vision. Suddenly—and none had greater claim to the title—he became a national hero. The turmoil of the times must explain to some extent the vitriolic attacks directed against him by the press. But their unhallowed source lay to a large extent in the press writer's psychology, who aims to startle or to strut forth as a tribune of the people, with little regard for the truth. A large class of newspapers may furnish abundant material for a study in mental pathology, but not for sober history.

In a few years the young Illinois commonwealth rose to be the second railroad state in the Union, and occupied first rank as a corn, wheat, oats and stock producing center. This rapid development was largely owing to a vast influx of immigrants. Settling in unfamiliar surroundings, they naturally became somewhat clannish, holding on to their language and their customs with un-

common persistence. And this clannishness was fostered by every political party openly courting the votes of the Irish, the Germans, the Swedes, the French and the rest. Thus was "foreignism" perpetuated by the very Americans whose primary duty should have been to bring about a complete fusion between native and immigrant stocks. If the melting pot has not functioned properly, all the blame should not be put on the foreigner.

With the superabundant production of foodstuffs that characterized Illinois during this period, and a very large cotton crop into the bargain, the cost of living kept on rising steadily. At the end of the war it had risen 300 per cent, while wages had risen only 50 to 100 per cent. In 1867, wheat sold in Springfield at $3.50 and flour at $18.00 a barrel. Disgraceful secret combinations of capitalists added to the burden. The "live stock ring" of Chicago was made possible because, unknown to the public, the railroads subscribed practically all the capital. Being then the largest live stock market in the world, they undertook to convert themselves into a secret exchange by suppressing the reports of sales of cattle in the daily newspapers. Thus they were able at times to buy hogs at five or six cents live weight and sell pork, ham and lard at more than double that price. In 1868, after wheat had been cornered three times, corn and barley twice, and rye and oats, once, a corner on pork forced up the price of pork products so high that the deluded farmers were aroused to defend themselves against their spoilators.

Everyone asked in dumb astonishment for the cause of this unprecedented rise. No one seemed able to supply an answer or a remedy, until within a short time a financial crisis of serious proportions brought about a general leveling.

The freedom of the press in time of war has always been a delicate question; conscientious criticism of military measures is readily turned into evidence of disloyalty and treason. Only one Illinois paper of importance, the *Chicago Times*, was suppressed by the military authorities. But the arbitrary action was followed by such a quick and overwhelming protest of citizens of both political parties that the President rescinded the order almost at once. After its ill-treatment the circulation of the paper increased materially among the common people.

Illinois has always been justly proud of the fact that the two

men who won the civil war, Lincoln and Grant, were sprung from her soil. All during the weary years of conflict the state furnished much more than its quota of troops, and there was never any need of resorting to conscription. The familiar story is retold in the present volume with justifiable pride. It is worth chronicling, however, that while the state lost 8,908 men in killed and wounded, more than twice that number (19,934) died from the ravages of disease.

The author remarks in his Preface that this particular period of Illinois history is complicated by the place taken by Illinois leaders on the roll of national heroes. And the historian finds himself torn between the demands of the common people for an interpretation of their democratic development against great odds, and the influence of the statesmen on the hustings, in the national legislature and the presidential chair, as well as that of the successful military commander. On the whole he has succeeded in balancing all the factors and in delineating the many-sided evolution of a great state with a completeness of detail that does not preclude a full grasp of the whole vivid moving panorama.

J. B. CULEMANS, Ph.D.

Studies in the Old South by the Present Day Students of a Virginia College. A Collection of Essays to which have been Awarded during the Past Ten Years the Dr. George W. Bagby Prize of Hampden-Sidney College for the Best Essay written by an Undergraduate upon Ante-Bellum Conditions in the South. 1916. Pp. 116.

A valuable addition to extant literature on conditions in the southland anterior to and during the American Civil War period and, from a southern standpoint, explaining the attitude of the seceding states, is found in the above publication.

The work appears as a striking illustration of the, perhaps, overly quoted "multum in parvo." The essays are ably treated by ten writers and turn mainly on questions of paramount interest to every student of the American pre-Civil and Civil War periods. The introduction consists of a one-page preface by George Gordon Battle. The titles of subjects treated, with authors, are as follows: The Influence of the Extensive Growth of Tobacco in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century, by W. W. Grover, 1906;

Slavery and its Influence in the Old South, by D. A. Haller, 1908; States' Rights, by L. H. Lancaster, 1909; Journalism and Authorship in the Ante-Bellum South, by Joseph M. Crockett, 1911; The Sovereignty of the State and Secession, by James M. Cecil, 1910; State Rights, by Charles Edwin Clarke, 1912; Causes of the Civil War, by John Gavack, Jr., 1913; The Secession of Virginia, by Ernest Trice Thompson, 1914; Half a Man; The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865, by R. E. Warwick, 1915; Ante-Bellum Fun in Old Virginia, by Geo. H. Gilmer, Jr., 1916.

The trend of general treatment of the above subjects, so intimately bearing on the war between the states, is mainly apologetic in character, the writers being imbued with the idea of explaining many misunderstood questions as to the motives and causes of the South's stand and action in the great fratricidal struggle. The fact that the various articles are penned by students of a southern educational institution of recognized high rank and concern matters with which the writers, from their very environment, must necessarily be familiar, give to the conclusions drawn a decided air of truth and accuracy. The warmth and earnestness of the apologists win our attention and enlist our sympathies.

In what is, perhaps, the most important of all the essays treated, the "Causes of the Civil War," the writer shows conclusively that the popular notion of the "for slavery" and "against slavery" positions respectively of the South and of the North as causative factors of the mighty conflict is erroneous. The same conclusion is brought out in the other also important essays on "States' Rights," "The Sovereignty of the State and Secession," "Slavery and its Influence in the Old South," and "The Secession of Virginia."

The writers of the above articles, as do all other southern authors who touch on the subject-matters involved, give as the primary cause of the Civil War the question of "States' Rights," the South holding each state to be supreme and, therefore, not subservient to the national government, and this from the belief that, in the words of Madison, the constitution is a "compact between the states in their highest capacity."

The proximate cause of the war, however, is given as to whether slavery was to be allowed in new States. The southerners naturally took the affirmative side, in order to have additional

markets for their surplus slaves, the monetary value of which represented, in the decade ending in 1860, a value of three and one-half billions of the total five billions of dollars of estimated southern properties. The North held slavery to be against the dictates of civilization and humanity and, consequently, considered its extension into new territories naught other than crime. The occasions of the war are shown to have been remotely John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry and proximately Lincoln's election and subsequent call for troops. In the quoted words of Jefferson Davis: "No alternative remained except to seek the security out of the union which they (the seceding states) had vainly tried to obtain within it."

Virginia's reluctant part in secession is pathetically shown. Her hand was forced. Neutral she could not remain. It was a question as to her siding with the North or her sister States, the South. Contrary to the popular belief, slavery to her was, in itself, distasteful, to which institution she had, more than once, shown even strong opposition. As a matter of fact, out of a population of 1,047,299 Virginians, only 52,128 were slave-owners. Her most notable military leaders, such as Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Joseph E. Johnston, A. P. Hill and J. E. B. Stuart, were not holders of slaves. The influence, too, of the growth of tobacco in bringing the blacks into Virginia for its cultivation is shown to be intimately connected with the question of slavery.

The earnestness of the writers, whilst adding zest to the general narrative, is productive at times of a few statements which appear to be somewhat overdrawn, as, for instance, where under the question, "Slavery and its Influence in the Old South," mention is made that the native African could not be degraded but was rather elevated by slavery in the States, a conclusion, whilst doubtless true in many cases, the general application of which may be seriously questioned.

We may conclude with the statement that the reader, in search of historic truth concerning the attitude of the South in the Civil War, will scarcely find in any other small work more tending to explain better and clarify the difficult and, in many cases, disputed questions than is found in the able and interesting essays of the little volume. The writers have succeeded admirably in their

principal purpose of giving to the public concisely and graphically a pen picture of southern conditions and motives of action during and preceding the momentous Civil War period. It is to be hoped that there may be forthcoming other larger works embracing the same or similar subject-matter and of the same standard of thought and diction as is manifested in the attractive publication, "Studies in the Old South."

F. Joseph Magri, M.A., D.D.

NOTES AND COMMENT

That there is a design in the bibliographical studies which have appeared in each number of the REVIEW since its beginning is evident to all who have at heart the desire to see the study of American Catholic history raised to a more critical plane.

That purpose has received encouragement from all who have a sincere interest in saving our historiography from being buried under the dead weight of mediocrity and of panegyric so characteristic of its past.

There would be little value to ourselves or to the students who follow us in listing sources upon sources for the study of our Church in this country unless we were free at the same time to judge without fear or favor their intrinsic historical merit: there would also be little advance in discriminating between the negligible and the valuable in Catholic historical works that have already been written unless at the same time our critical appraisal were to serve as a guide and likewise as a warning to those who seek entrance into the difficult field of American Church history.

In carrying out this design, in listing the sources which go to make up a *Biographical Dictionary of the American Hierarchy*, we have been proceeding on the assumption that, as far as our own country is in question, the biographical approach to its Church history is the most natural one the student can take. The personal element in church movements in America is so emphatic that we would fail to understand any period or any diocese adequately if due proportion were not given to biographical studies.

Biography it is which gives to history vitality and concreteness; and in the biographies of our ecclesiastical leaders, we can best find a natural and obvious continuity in the Church history of the past. "Biography when distinctly urged as a bridge to history," writes Johnson, in the *Teaching of History*, p. 171 (New York, 1916), "commonly emphasizes the former." In American history, as in American Church history, biography still proves to be the best introduction. We have but a faint background of tradition to our institutional life, and few phases of our national culture have reached that completion of development which in European countries necessarily subordinates the individual to the group.

Certain questions arise quite naturally from this fact:

What precisely is biography?

In what does it differ from history?

What is the purpose of biography?

What are the principles of historical criticism upon which the biographer should base the choice of his subject and the treatment thereof?

What are the biographer's obligations to truth, to justice, and to charity?

Should everything in the life of the subject be told?

Is suppression of fact in the biographical narrative ever ethical?

Should the life of the ecclesiastic be approached with the same candor and frankness as that of the layman?

Where should ecclesiastical biography branch off from ordinary biography and from hagiography?

Is there not an accepted canon that in the life of the churchman only that which is edifying may be told?

These are questions of theoretical import, it is true; but unless they are answered in all honesty, it will be impossible for the student to find an answer for the more important practical question; namely, *of what value historically are the lives of the members of the American Hierarchy written thus far?* From Brent's *Biographical Sketch of the Most Rev. John Carroll*, published in Baltimore in 1843, down to the late Cardinal Farley's *Life of John Cardinal McCloskey, First Prince of the Church in America*, published in 1918, the number of episcopal biographies has already reached the proportions of a respectable library. If it be true, therefore, that the history of the Catholic Church in the United States is best understood in the lives of its leaders, then the episcopal biographies we possess must be subjected to rigid critical tests before they can be accepted by the historian as materials for his account of Catholicism in America. Certainly no episcopal biography yet written seems to be deserving of a permanent place in American literature. Why is this? Is it because these sketches fall short of the ideals of biographical technique, or is it because of the confusion between history and biography? Or is it because their day has been too near our own?

Biography has always presented a complex problem to the student of literature and of history. All are not agreed upon its definition, though all are agreed that the province of biography is distinct from that of history. In his *English Biography* (London, 1916), Waldo H. Dunn tells us that although it has been generally taken for granted that every one knows what biography is, no one seems to have given us a definition that is adequate. "To say that biography is the history of one man's life, is, at least," he writes, "to be clear and succinct, but the definition is no more than a beginning of the expository process. It is easy enough to say that the history of a man's life constitutes his biography; it is not so easy to declare what should go to make up the history, still less easy to say just what is meant by the life of which the history is to treat. What do we mean when we speak of *the life* of a man? The expression is common, and every one knows, or thinks he knows, what the term means." Edmund Gosse, in his article on *Biography* in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, in considering what biography in its pure sense ought to be, states that we can best reach a standard of evaluation by deciding what biography should not be.

> It is not a philosophical treatise nor a polemical pamphlet. It is not even a portion of the human contemporary chronicle. Broad views are entirely out of place in biography, and there is perhaps no greater literary mistake than to attempt what is called the *Life and Times* of a man . . . *History* deals with fragments of the vast roll of events; it must always begin abruptly and close in the middle of affairs; it must always deal impartially with a vast number of persons. *Biography* is a study sharply defined by two definite events—birth and death. It fills its canvas with one figure, and other personages, however great in themselves, must always be subsidiary to the central hero.

We may, then, accept as a provisional definition of biography that it is the story, from birth to death, of one man's life in its external manifestations and in its inward development. But the acceptance of this definition leaves still another —perhaps a more important—problem to be settled: *Whose is the life that deserves the narration thereof?* All who have written on the subject tell us that biography is the result of an overpowering desire in the heart of man to perpetuate the deeds of one of his fellows. In his *Principles of Biography*, England's greatest master in the art, Sidney Lee, holds that "biography exists to satisfy a natural instinct in man—the commemorative instinct—the universal desire to keep alive the memories of those who by character and exploits have distinguished themselves from the mass of mankind" (p. 9). Lee would have us, therefore, write only the Lives of those whose *character and exploits* have warranted their tradition to posterity.

This distinction is not very helpful *post factum*, for ecclesiastical *Lives* lie as thick as autumn leaves on ecclesiastical reading tables. It must be confessed that Church history faces a difficulty here; if the test of *character and exploits* were to be rigidly applied to Church leaders, there would be a rather shadowy justification for the numerous ecclesiastical *Lives* written thus far. The problem becomes more complicated when we consider that to allow the biographer to apply his own self-made canon of exclusion to any member of the hierarchy in a given country would rob the Church historian of a later day of much of his best material. If Ciacconius had applied the rule of character and exploits in his *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium ab initio nascentis Ecclesiae usque ad Clementem IX*, his work could not be listed by Pastor in his *History of the Popes* as a source of first value.

On the principle: *qui facit per alium, facit per se*, one would be obliged to admit that at least every bishop should have his biography, since around him and through his *haute direction*, all work of the diocese centers and develops. To respect the memory of a prelate whose episcopate has left its impress, however faint, on the diocese over which he rules, is by most ecclesiastics considered sufficient warrant for writing his biography. The ordinary belief is that as a Governor in the Church, a Chief Shepherd of the Flock, a Husbandman in the Vineyard, an Alter Christus to his priests, the bishop of a diocese has had opportunities of strengthening Catholic life and action within his jurisdiction and

of placing the progress of his diocese abreast of the universal Church. His character may be comparable to the best men of his time; his exploits may be of such a kind that the nation itself feels that he is as large a factor in national progress as in church affairs. On the other hand, his character and his exploits may be the opposite. His life may have been spent, *in dir Stille*, in building up the broken walls of a diocese, the shattered bonds of unity among his people, the weakened spirit of concord with those of other faiths. But the question whether he should have the narrative of his labors written for posterity cannot be judged by the same rule as one applies to men in the world. In reality, owing to the close dependence of American Church history upon biographical narrative, each diocese should have an accurate, complete, and official biographical series of the bishops who have ruled it in the past.

Passing to the question of biographical technique, what should be said about the rule so strongly emphasized by the editors of the *Dictionary of National Biography:* namely, biographical independence of ethics, history, and science? Should ecclesiastical biography be autonomous in design and in treatment? "Biography," Lee writes, "must resolutely preserve its independence of three imposing themes of study, which are often seen to compete for its control. True biography is no handmaid of ethical instruction. Its purpose is not that of history. It does not serve biological or anthropological science. Any assistance that biography renders these three great interests—ethical, historical and scientific—should be accidental; such aid is neither essential nor obligatory. Biography rules a domain of its own; it is autonomous" (*Principles of Biography* p. 6). The ecclesiastical biographer can scarcely accept exclusion from the field of ethics and of history. The student of Church History welcomed the day when what is called genetic history or history based upon the scientific method of modern criticism began to dawn; but he realizes also that the process of systematic arrangement and examination of facts of history does not constitute a satisfying ideal. Whether or no modern criticism welcome the truth that man instinctively desires to learn lessons for the present from the past, that truth is too evident for denial. To adapt a passage from Devas' *Key to the World's Progress*: can we not suffer the biographer, cleric or lay, without this prejudgment of the moral value of his subject, to pursue his narrative in peace and to allow the facts to speak for themselves? But facts themselves are dumb, and a biographer is no purveyor of an indiscriminate collection of facts; he is no scientific chronicler, but precisely one whose narrative is the fruit of a process of reasoning. For out of the vast mass of recorded facts, oftentimes a confused and unintelligent heap, he must select what is pertinent, relevant, important, and characteristic. No gazing at facts will provide the biographer with what may be called a theoretical anticipation of the lesson his Life will produce upon the reader. Before he enters the labyrinth of a man's life, he must have a lamp to guide him.

That lamp should be lighted by the steady flame of edification. This must be admitted at the outset; unless the ecclesiastical biographer accept this apriori

standard, his work will be useless. That he will, thereby, cut himself off from his fellows in the field of critical history does not always follow, for everything will depend upon his treatment of his subject. There are two problems in the manner of edification—*how much can be told and how should it be told.* The Church has always been jealous of panegyric, and no biography of an ecclesiastic will receive her *Imprimatur* unless the author preface his work with the now familiar disavowal:

> It only remains to submit all that is here written to the judgment of the Church, and to declare in conformity with the decrees of Urban VIII, and of other Popes, that only human authority is here ascribed to the facts related and to the appellations indicating sanctity used in regard to the subject, etc.

How much can be told? Platzhoff in his *Theorie der Biographie* says rather succinctly: "Das Ideal des Biographen sei jene heitere Weise . . . der Gutes sieht, wo er kann, Böses, wo er muss, der als Mensch von Menschen zu Menschen redet." The classic example of *suppression* in modern Catholic biography is that which occurred in the publication of Purcell's *Manning.* An equally classic example of *inclusion* is Snead-Cox's *Life of Cardinal Vaughan.* The biographer saw his difficulty and met it nobly:

> Then the question came: Was it right to put out in print the private outpourings of these intimate and spiritual diaries? It may be said at once there are things given in these volumes which I know the Cardinal, in his life-time, would—well, have cut off his hand rather than allow to be published. But ought that certainty to have been decisive against publication now? Or, rather, should not the question shape itself in this fashion—Would Cardinal Vaughan now wish withheld from the world anything he had done, or thought, or suffered, the knowledge of which could make for good, or serve for a help, or an example, or an inspiration, to anyone? That question seemed to me to answer itself.

Snead-Cox could add in all truthfulness: "If I have not been candid, I am without excuse"; on the same principle Baronius states in his *Annales: Nihil veritas erubescit, nisi solumnodo abscondi!*

The problem of truthfulness is undoubtedly not to be solved apart from that of opportuneness. Frederick Denison Maurice had said somewhere that no man's life ought to be published till twenty years after his death. Time softens many things, if not all, in human life, and its passage brings a better and clearer perspective. "A contemporary can never judge as the historian a hundred years after the fact judges, but the contemporary view has also its place, and it may be really nearer to the living truth than is the conclusion formed when the past is cold and remote and the actors are dead long ago" (Thayer, *Theodore Roosevelt,* p. xi, New York, 1920).

Manning had a horror of seeing his own *Life* in print before his death. "To write my life, while I am still alive," he said, "is like putting me into my coffin before I am dead." How long an interested public should wait is a much debated question; but certainly it must be admitted that once the biographer begins his work, he should be dominated by the determination to tell the truth.

Not that he needs to enter the sacred tabernacle of a man's heart, as the jaunty Purcell has done, with an irresponsible wish to suppress nothing, as he tells us in the *Life of Manning* (Vol. i, p. vii). Discrimination is as much a part of truth-telling as truth itself, for it is always more easy to deal with the dead and buried past than with the events and actors of our own days. Some *Lives* should be left to the care of posterity, which can see them with clearer eyes and judge them more fairly. The sanctities of life are not to be violated, the living are not to be wounded, the dead are not to be wronged—in the interests of truth, for truth in that case becomes selfish and domineering.

Faber says somewhere in his letters that every man has many biographies running in parallel lines in his life. To tell the story of the whole man requires a profound appreciation of the task in hand and a religious respect for the dead. We have indeed departed from the biographical canon laid down by Wordsworth that we should shield a man by shrinking from the truth:

> Silence is a privilege of the grave, a right to the departed; let him, therefore, who infringes that right, by speaking publicly of, for, or against, those who cannot speak for themselves, take heed that he opens not his mouth without a sufficient sanction. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, is a rule in which these sentiments have been pushed to an extreme that proves how deeply humanity is interested in maintaining them.

But once begun—once this sufficient sanction is present—the biographer must reveal to us the man himself—the whole man. This Capecelatro holds to be the chief defect of the earlier ecclesiastical biographers, in that they are wanting in the proper order of development and in historical description of the whole inner life of their subjects (*Life of St. Philip Neri*, Vol. i, p. xiii). In a little known treatise on historical method, the Preface to the *Acta Sanctorum* (t. i, p. xxxii), the rule of biographical candidness is given as follows: Profiteor me quae de Sanctis tradita litteris repererim dare, nihil assuere, nihil mutare,nihil meopte ingenio emendare, nihil praecidere, integra omnia et inviolata afferre, quoad possum.

We have a right indeed to expect that the ecclesiastical biographer will give us—by a judicious choice and detail of particular actions and episodes in the life of his subject—a living image of his hero. The truth must not be deformed to meet the unreasonable wish of those who hold it in fear. At best, life presents a tangled skein, good and ill juxtaposed, and a truthful picture of a life lived *in dem Strom der Welt* can alone satisfy the canons of modern historical criticism. To bury our subject under a load of platitudes is part of that idealized biography which has long since passed out. We desiderate a living image of the subject, walking, talking, breathing, sighing, weeping, laughing, as was his wont in life. "Se l'Evangelista non ha celato il peccato e la caduta del Guida"—Purcell quotes this rather gleefully as one of Leo XIII's statements to Manning—"perché dobbiamo noi celare il peccato di vescovi ed altri personaggi?" (Vol. ii, p. 755).

The biographer's work falls into two departments, we are told by Wilfrid Ward, the biographer of four eminent Englishmen—his own father, Cardinal Wiseman, Aubrey de Vere, and Cardinal Newman. In his *Last Lectures* (New York, 1918), the distinguished essayist enters into the problem of the *Nature and Limits of Character Study*, and emphasizes the fact that the biographer must first study *all available material* in order to make his own idea of his subject quite complete. He must then attempt as an artist to present the picture which has been formed in his own mind from the whole material, by choosing for publication a *convincing selection* from that material. "This," he says, "is the only true method of biography . . . the biographer must study all and use at his discretion whatever serves best for a convincing picture. That must be his sole principle in selection" (p. 158). Mr. Ward defines the principal kinds of material at the disposal of the biographer as: (1) Letters, (2) recorded conversation, (3) diaries and autobiographies, (4) the reminiscences of friends, (5) incidental self-revelations in works already published (p. 175).

Wilfrid Ward's brief article, *Candour in Biography*, begins with the admission that "the careful student who wishes to form an accurate judgment of a given character should see the whole available evidence. The suppression of the 'astute' or the 'timid' are so far prejudicial to perfect truth and accuracy. I go a step further, and do not care to dispute that, apart from letters unintelligible or misleading, without explanation of their circumstances, the public may, in the long run, form the truer impression of a man from a very liberal publication of his letters."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GUIDE TO THE BIOGRAPHICAL SCOURCES OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY[1]

(D—E—F)

DAVID, Bishop John Baptist Mary (1761–1841); Coadjutor Bp. of Bardstown (1819–1832); Bp. of Bardstown (1832–1833); resigned 1833.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 31; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 280–282; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 256–267; *Researches*, Vol. xiii, pp. 23 ss. (Account of his Appointment as Bishop of Bardstown and of Bishop Flaget's Resignation and Assumption of the See); *ibid.*, Vol. xiv, pp. 158–160; Vol. xix, p. 142; Vol. xxiii, p. 277; Vol. xxviii, p. 343; MAES, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx, passim*, Cincinnati, 1880; WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky*, pp. 384–353, Louisville, 1884; SPALDING, *Sketches of the Life, Times, and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, First Bishop of Louisville*, pp. 242–259, Louisville, 1853; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians in the United States*, pp. 161–166. New York, 1917; CHR, Vol. i, p. 312, Vol. ii, pp. 77, 227, 229–230, 284; Vol. iv, pp. 32, 71; Vol. v, pp. 240–241; MCCANN, *History of Mother Seton's Daughters*, Vol. ii, pp. 105, 120. *A Spiritual Retreat of Eight Days*, by Bishop David. Edited with additions by M. T. Spalding. Louisville, 1844.

DELANY, Bishop John (1864–1906); Bp. of Manchester (1904–1906).

CHR, Vol. ii, p. 307; [G.C.D.], *Life and Writings of the Rt. Rev. John Bernard Delany, D.D., Second Bishop of Manchester*, Lowell, 1911.

DE GOESBRIAND, Bishop Louis (1816–1899); Bp. of Burlington (1853–1899).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 49; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 195–197; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 299, 429; *Researches*, Vol. xxviii, p. 160; DE GOESBRIAND, *Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire*. Burlington, Vt., 1866. DE GOESBRIAND, *The Young Converts*. New York, 1908.

DE LA HAILANDIÈRE, Bishop Celestine (1798–1882); Bp. of Vincennes (1839–1847); resigned 1847.

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 51; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 385; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 295–312; ALERDING, *History of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Vincennes*, pp. 162–173, Indianapolis, 1883; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 287; *Discourse on the Occasion of the Entombment of Mgr. Celestin de la Hailandière, Second Bishop of Vincennes*, preached by Bishop Chatard, November 22, 1882, Indianapolis, 1882.

DE NECKERE, Bishop Leo Raymond, C.M. (1800–1833); Bp. of New Orleans (1830–1833).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 78–79; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 122–123; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 518–527; *Researches*, Vol. ix, p. 88; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 128, 428; Vol. iv, p. 69.

---

[1] *Cf.* CHR., Vol. v, pp. 120–128 (A–B), Vol. v, pp. 290–296 (C). ABBREVIATIONS: ACHS (*American Catholic Historical Society*); ACQR (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*); AHR (*American Historical Review*); CE (*Catholic Encyclopedia*); CHR (*Catholic Historical Review*); CUB (*Catholic University Bulletin*); CW (*Catholic World*); ICHR (*Illinois Catholic Historical Review*); USCHS (*United States Catholic Historical Society*).

De St. Palais, Bishop Maurice de Long d'Aussac (1811–1877); Bp. of Vincennes (1849–1877).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 102; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, p. 387; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 313–323; *Researches*, Vol. vii, p. 100, Vol. xxviii, p. 255; Alerding, *op. cit.*, pp. 190–210; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 287.

Domenec, Bishop Michael, C.M., (1816–1878); Bp. of Pittsburgh (1860–1876); Bp. of Alleghany (1876–1877); resigned 1877.

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 33; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 338–339; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 583–591; Lambing, *History of the Catholic Church in the Dioceses of Pittsburgh and Alleghany*, pp. 85–116; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 24.

Doran, Bishop Thomas (1868–1916); Auxiliary Bp. of Providence (1915–1916).

Files of the *Catholic Transcript*, January, 1916; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 300.

Dufal, Bishop Peter, C.S.C. (1822–1898). Titular Bp. of Delcon and Vicar-Apostolic of Eastern Bengal (1860–1878); Coadjutor Bp. of Galveston (1878–1880); resigned 1880.

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 36; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 135, 429.

Duggan, Bishop James (1825–1899); Coadjutor to Archbp. of St. Louis (1857–1859); Bp. of Chicago (1859–1870); retired 1870.

Reuss, *op. cit.*, pp. 36–37; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 173, 597; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 152; Phillips, *Bishop Duggan and the Chicago Diocese*, in the ICHR, Vol. ii, pp. 365–368; *Catholic Church in Chicago*, pp. 196–201.

Dubois, Bishop John (1764–1842); Bp. of New York (1826–1842).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, 34; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 34–36; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 414–437; *Researches*, Vol. vi, pp. 91, 122–124; Vol. viii, pp. 42, 170, Vol. ix, pp. 85–86, Vol. xxix, p. 200; Herbermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 187–193, 204; Herbermann in the USCHS *Hist. Records and Studies*, Vol. x, pp. 124–129 (*Bishop Dubois in New York in 1836*); Farley, *Life of Cardinal McCloskey*, pp. 20, 27, 49, 50, 56, 63, 111, 112, 146, 150, 160, 362; Flynn, *Catholic Church in New Jersey*, pp. 49, 78, 90–98, 101–109, 115, 260, Morristown, N. J., 1904; Bayley, *Brief Sketch, etc.*, pp. 29–105; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 285–286, Vol. ii, p. 140, Vol. iv, pp. 12, 404, 411, Vol. v, pp. 239, 251, 309; L. W. Reilly, *Bishop John Dubois*, in the CW, Vol. xxxiv, pp. 454–460; CE, Vol. v, p. 178; Smith, *The Catholic Church in New York*, New York, 1905–1908; Farley, *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral*, New York, 1908; McCann, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 22–28, 38–49, 81–89, 96–97, 123–134, 170, 198, 224, 244; Vol. ii, pp. 3, 70, 114; McSweeny, Vol. i, pp. 2–16, 23–76, 81–126, 130–175, 251–285, 301–313, 352–376, 383–397, 401–431, 505–516, 551–555; *Jubilee of Mt. St. Mary's College*, pp. 235–288, New York, 1859. Moreau, *Les Prêtres Français Emigrés aux Etats-Unis*. Paris, 1856; Mulrenan, *Brief Historical Sketch of the Catholic Church on Long Island*. New York, 1871.

Du Bourg, Bishop Louis Valentine (1766–1833); Administrator-Apostolic of Louisiana—the Floridas (1812–1815); Bp. of Louisiana (1815–1826); Bp. of Montauban, France (1826–1833); Archbp. of Besancon (Feb.-Dec., 1833).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 34; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 120–122; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 205–238; *Researches*, Vol. vi, p. 191, Vol. viii, p. 103, Vol. x, pp. 144–152, (*Bibliography of Bishop Du Bourg*), Vol. xi, pp. 157–159, Vol.

xii, pp. 10, 94, Vol. xx, p. 22, Vol. xxii, pp. 17, 389, 398, Vol. xxvi, pp. 48. 272, Vol. xxviii, p. 345; HERBERMANN, *Sulpicians, etc.*, pp. 170–180, 199, 222–226, 231; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 64, 277, 630, Vol. ii, pp. 5–21 *passim*, 165–169, 392–416, 448, 470, Vol. iv, pp. 52–75, 448, 452–469, Vol. v, pp. 221, 356; CE, Vol. v, pp. 178–179; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 39, 49, 118–120, Vol. ii, pp. 70, 114; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 13, 16, 24, 27, 49, 155–156, 390.

DUBUIS, Bishop Claude Mary (1817–1859); Bp. of Galveston (1862–1881); retired 1881; titular Archbp. of Arca (1894–1895).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 35–36; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 238–239; *Researches*, Vol. iii, pp. 4–7; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 135, 149.

DUNNE, Bishop Edward Joseph (1848–1910); Bp. of Dallas (1893–1910).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 37; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 138, 430, Vol. iii, p. 154.

DURIER, Bishop Anthony (1832–1904); Bp. of Natchitoches (1885–1904).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 23; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 319–320; CHR, Vol. ii. pp. 135, 429.

DWENGER, Bishop Joseph, C.PP.S. (1837–1893); Bp. of Fort Wayne (1873–1893).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 38; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 236–238; CHR, Vol. ii. p. 290, Vol. v, pp. 311–357, *passim*.

ECCLESTON, Archbishop Samuel S.S., (1801–1851); Archbp. of Baltimore (1834–1851).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 38; *Catholic Expositor* for February, 1843; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 72–74; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 527–546; *Researches*, Vol. vii, p. 104, Vol. viii, p. 130, Vol. ix, pp. 138–142, Vol. xii, p. 137, Vol. xv, pp. 77, 151, Vol. xix, p. 176, 178; ROTHENSTEINER, *Archbishop Eccleston and the Visitandines of Kaskaskia*, in the ICHR. Vol. i, pp. 500–509; HERBERMANN, *op. cit.*, pp. 85–86, 276–281; CHR, Vol. i. pp. 37, 373, 374; CE, Vol. v, p. 269; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 5, 20, 60, 87, 90, 108–115 *passim;* MCSWEENY, Vol. i, pp. 114–123 *passim*, 171, 339, 348, 380–382, 402–411, 430, 472.

EGAN, Bishop Michael, O.S.F. (1761(?)–1814); Bp. of Philadelphia (1808–1814).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 38–39 (important letters on his life); SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 155–156; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 185–191; *Researches*, Vol. iii, pp. 53, 54, 60, pp. 2, 139, 144, Vol. vi, pp. 43–45, Vol. viii, pp. 65, 154, Vol. ix and x *passim* (*The History of the Schism in Philadelphia*); Vol. xvii, p. 79, Vol. xviii, p. 4, Vol. xxviii, p. 377; consult *Index* to *Researches;* KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, pp. 195–210; GRIFFIN, *History of the Rt. Rev. Michael Egan, D.D., First Bishop of Philadelphia.* Phila., 1893; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 311, 369, 439, Vol. iii, p. 22; CE, Vol. v, p. 324; see under CONWELL; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 32, 76, 82–85, 95, 100–132 *passim*, 219–25 *passim*, 413–534; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 37, 94, 112.

ELDER, Archbishop William Henry (1819–1904); Bp. of Natchez (1857–1880); coadjutor to Archbp. Purcell (1880–1883); Archbp. of Cincinnati (1883–1904).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 38; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 109–111; *Character Glimpses of Archbishop Elder*, Cincinnati, 1911; CE, Vol. v, p. 373; *Archbishop*

Elder's Jubilee Album, Cincinnati, 1896; *Catholic Telegraph*, files for October, 1904; McSweeny, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 29, 36, 78, 366–372, 419–438, Vol. ii, pp. 63, 127, 180–182, 197–213, 223–226, 310.

England, Bishop John (1786–1842); Bp. of Charleston (1820–1842).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 271–309; *Researches*, Vols. v-xxix *passim*, chiefly Vol. xiii, pp. 151, Vol. xix, p. 111, Vol. xxviii, p. 245, for which consult *Index; The Works of the Right Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston.* Edited with *Introduction, Notes* and *Index*, under the direction of the Most Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee. 7 vols., Cleveland, 1908; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 55, 265, 270, 357, 375–376, 449–450, Vol. iii, p. 40, Vol. v, pp. 239–301 *passim;* CE, Vol. v, pp. 470–471; McCann, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 112, 145, 195, 197, 211, 318; vide *The Messenger* for 1890, pp. 769–782, and for 1892, pp. 370–374; Read, *Sketches of Bishop England* in the *Religious Cabinet*, Vol. i (1842), pp. 361–380; O'Connell, *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia.*

Farley, Cardinal John (1842–1918); Titular Bp. of Zeugma and Auxiliary of New York (1895–1902); Archbp. of New York (1902–1918); created Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, under the title of Sancta Maria Supra Minervam, November 27, 1911.

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 40; CHR, Vol. ii. p. 140; Guilday, *John Cardinal Farley*, in the *Catholic World*, Vol. cviii, pp. 183–193; *Catholic News*, files for September, 1918.

Feehan, Archbishop Patrick Augustine (1829–1902); Bp. of Nashville (1865–1880); Archbp. of Chicago (1880–1902).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 41; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 100–103; *Catholic Church in Chicago*, pp. 227–253; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 288, Vol. iii, p. 152.

Fenwick, Bishop Benedict Joseph, S.J. (1782–1894); Bp. of Boston (1825–1846).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 41; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 87–89; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 374–413; *Researches*, Vol. viii, pp. 93, 170, 175, Vol. ix, pp. 95, 159, 191, Vol. x, p. 159, Vol. xx, pp. 3, 173, 176, Vol. xxii, pp. 91, 260, 277, 288, Vol. xxvi, pp. 23, 244, 274, 290; Herbermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 72, 204; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 296; McCann, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 146, 210; McSweeny, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 4, 165, 213, 277, 288, 300, 407, 432.

Fenwick, Bishop Edward Dominic, O.P. (1768–1832); Bp. of Cincinnati (1822–1832).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, p. 41; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 103–105; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 328–352; *Researches*, Vol. iii, p. 27, Vol. v, p. 390, Vol. ix, p. 160, Vol. xi, pp. 113, 123; Herbermann, *op. cit.*, p. 184; CHR, Vol. ii, pp. 20, 26, 27, 65–68, 312–317; his life is being written by the Rev. Victor O'Daniel, O.P., Associate Editor of the CHR; the Rev. John Lamott, D.D., Ph.D., of St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati, has in course of preparation a *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (1821–1921); McCann, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 146–194 *passim; cf., An Early Pastoral Letter* (1827) in CHR, Vol. i, pp. 65–68.

Fink, Bishop Louis Mary, O.S.B. (1834–1904); Bp. of Eucarpia i.p.i. (1871); Bp. of Leavenworth (1877–1904).

Reuss, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–42; Shea, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 270–273; Clarke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 623; CHR, Vol. i, p. 388.

FITZGERALD, Bishop Edward (1833–1907); Bp. of Little Rock (1867–1907).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 42; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 275–276; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 80, 240; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 133; *cf*, GIBBONS, *Retrospect of Fifty Years*. Baltimore, 1916.

FITZPATRICK, Bishop John Bernard (1812–1866); Coadjutor-Bp. of Boston (1844–1846); Bp. of Boston (1846–1866).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 43; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 89–91; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 310–336; *Researches*, Vol. iii, p. 93, Vol. viii, p. 5, Vol. ix, p. 185, Vol. xxvi, p. 234; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 154, 160, Vol. ii, pp. 297.

FLAGET, Bishop Benedict Joseph, S.S. (1763–1850; First Bp. of Bardstown (1810–1832); resigned 1832; reappointed 1833; "third" Bp. of Bardstown (1833–1841); transferred to Louisville (1841); Bp. of Louisville (1841–1850).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–44; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 277–280; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 144–163; *Researches*, Vols. v-xxvi *passim*, for which consult *Index;* SPALDING, *Sketches of the Life . . . of Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, etc.*, Louisville, 1852; SPALDING, *Sketches of Kentucky*, Louisville, 1844, HOWLETT in ACHS *Records*, Vol. xxix, pp. 37–60 (*Bishop Flaget's Diary);* MAES, *Life of Nerinckx, passim*, Cincinnati, 1880; CHR, Vol. i, pp. 315–319; Vol. iii, pp. 5–20; *passim;* CE, Vol. vi, pp. 93–94; MCCANN, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 23–41, 157–158, 215, 216, 277, 290; MCSWEENY, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 10, 16, 48, 50, 71, 227, 243, 293, 321–327; *Monseigneur Flaget, Evêque de Bardstown et Louisville, sa Vie, son Esprit, et ses Vertus, per le Prêtre qui accompagnait le prelat pendant les voyages qu'il fit en Europe pour l'oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi*, Paris, 1851; *Auszuge aus der Geschichte der Dioecese Louisville: Leben des Hoch. Bischofs Benedict Joseph Flaget*, Louisville, 1884, (Translation of Spalding's *Life*); vide *Bishop Flaget's Report on the Diocese of Bardstown to Pius VII*, (April 10, 1815), in the CHR, Vol. i, pp. 305–319.

FLASCH, Bishop Killian Caspar (1837–1891); Bp. of La Crosse (1859–1891).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 44; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 29.

FOLEY, Bishop John Samuel (1833–1918); Bp. of Detroit (1888–1918).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 44; HERBERMANN, *op. cit.*, pp. 242, 294; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 286; *cf.*, files of *Baltimore Catholic Review*, for November, 1918.

FOLEY, Bishop Thomas (1822–1879); Coadjutor-Bp. of Chicago (1869); Administrator of Chicago (1870–1879).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 44; CLARKE, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 171–188; SHEA, *Hierarchy, etc.*, pp. 99–100; *Catholic Church in Chicago*, pp. 202–226, Chicago, 1891; CHR, Vol. iii, p. 152.

FOREST, Bishop John Anthony (1838–1911); Bp. of San Antonio (1895–1911).

REUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 44; CHR, Vol. ii, p. 136.

PETER GUILDAY.

(*To be continued.*)

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notices in later issues of the* REVIEW.)

ADAMS, HENRY. *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 317.

ARONOVICI, CAROL, Ph.D. *Americanization.* St. Paul: Keller Publishing Company, 1919.

BENEDICT, BERTRAM, A. B. *A History of the Great War.* Vol. ii. New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1919. Pp. 997.

BETTEN, REV. FR. A. J., and KAUFMANN, REV. ALFRED, S. J. *The Modern World.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1919. Pp. 901.

BUSHNELL, DAVID I., JR. *Native Villages and Village Sites East of the Mississippi* in Bulletin 69, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 111.

BUTLER, RT. REV. CUTHBERT. *Benedictine Monachism;* Studies in Benedictine Life and Rule. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 387.

CARLTON, ROBERT, ESQ. *The New Purchase, or Seven and a Half Years in the Far West.* Indiana Centennial Edition. Edited by James Albert Woodburn. Princeton University Press, 1916. Pp. 522.

Centennial Jubilee of St. Patrick's Cathedral, 1818-1919. Rochester, N. Y. Pp. 96.

CHAMBRUN, COLONEL DE and CAPTAIN DE MARENCHES. *The American Army in the European Conflict.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 436.

COAKLEY, THOMAS F. *The Fifth Station.* Pittsburgh: The Catholic Truth Society, 1919.

CONNELL, REV. FRANCIS M., S.J. *A Short Grammar of Attic Greek.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1920. Pp. 196.

COOPER, CLAYTON SEDGWICK. *Understanding South America.* New York: George H. Doran, 1918. Pp. 426.

DALY, T. A. *McAroni Ballads.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1919. Pp. 149.

DAVIDSON, GORDON CHARLES, Ph.D. *The North West Company,* in the University of California Publications in History. Vol. vii. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 347.

DONNELLY, FRANCIS P., S.J. *Imitation and Analysis: English Exercises Based on Irving's Sketch Book.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1902. Pp. 187.

DONNELLY, FRANCIS P., S.J. *Model English, Book II: The Qualities of Style.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1919. Pp. 301.

Federal Executive Departments as Sources of Information for Libraries. Compiled by Edith Guerrier, September 1, 1919. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1919, No. 74. Department of the Interior. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. Pp. 203.

FEWKES, J. WALKER. *Prehistoric Villages, Castles and Towers of Southwestern Colorado.* Bureau of American Ethnology. Smithsonian Institution. Bulletin 70. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 79 and 33.

FOX, EARLY LEE, Ph.D. *The American Colonization Society,* 1817-1840. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Series xxxvii, No. 1. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1919. Pp. 231.

FRANCOIS, VICTOR E., Ph.D. *Fifteen French Plays.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1919. Pp. 208.

GWYNN, STEPHEN. *John Redmond's Last Years.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 351.

HADLEY, ARTHUR TWINING: *The Moral Basis of Democracy. Sunday Morning Talks to Students and Graduates.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919. Pp. 206.

HIGGINS, REV. JAMES. *Stories of Great Heroes, Discoverers, Explorers and Christianizers of America.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 142.

HODGE, F. W. *Bibliography of Fra Alonso de Benavides. Indian Notes and Monographs.* A series of publications relating to the American Aborigines. New York: Museum of the American Indian Heye Foundation, 1919. Pp. 39.

HOLMES, W. H. *Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities.* Part I, Introductory. *The Lithic Industries.* Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 60. Washington, D. C: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 380.

HUNTER-BLAIR, RT. REV. SIR DAVID BART, M. A. *A Medley of Memories; Fifty Years' Recollection of a Benedictine Monk.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 305.

HUNTING, WARREN B., Ph.D. *The Obligation of Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution,* in Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1919. Pp. 122.

IGLEHART, FERDINAND COWLE, D.D., *Theodore Roosevelt.* New York: The Christian Herald, 1919. Pp. 442.

KINSMAN, FREDERICK JOSEPH. *Salve Mater.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920. Pp. 302.

LEBRETON, JULES. *Le Dieu Vivant.* Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1919. Pp. 181.

LOCKINGTON, W. J., S.J., with Introduction by G. K. CHESTERTON. *The Soul of Ireland.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Pp. 182.

MALOUBIER, EUGENE F. *Le Retour des Soldats.* A French Comedy in one Act. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1919. Pp. 89.

MARTIN ET LABICHE, Edited by VICTOR A. FRANCOIS, Ph.D. *Le Voyage de Monsieur Perrichon.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1919.

NOEL, F. REGIS, A.B., A.M., LL.B. *A History of the Bankruptcy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America.* A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Philosophy of The Catholic University of America. Pp. 210.

PARKINS, ALMON ERNEST, Ph.D. *The Historical Geography of Detroit.* Lansing: Michigan Historical Commission, 1918. Pp. 356.

PLASSMANN, P. THOMAS, O.F.M. *Bartholomaeus Anglicus.* Extractum ex Periodico Archivu. Franciscanum Historicum. Vol. ii. Fasc. i-ii, 1919. Pp. 44.

Prepared for the City Club of Chicago. *Ideals of America.* Analysis of the Guiding Motives of Contemporary American Life by Leaders in Various Fields of Thought and Action. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1919. Pp. 324.

ROBERTS, OCTAVIA. *With Lafayette in America.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company. Pp. 293.

Rome and the Study of Scripture. A Collection of Papal Enactments on the Study of Holy Scripture, together with the Decisions of the Biblical Commission. St. Meinrad, Ind: Abbey Press, 1919. Pp. 72.

SIEBERT, WILBUR H. *The Tory Proprietors of Kentucky Lands.* Reprinted from *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly.* Vol. xxviii, No. 1, January, 1919. Columbus, Ohio: The F. J. Heer Printing Company, 1919. Pp. 26.

SMITH, JUSTIN H. *The War With Mexico.* Vol. i. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 272.

SWEET, WILLIAM WARREN. *A History of Latin America.* New York: The Abingdon Press, 1919. Pp. 283.

TAYLOR, HUGH. *Origin of Government.* Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1919. Pp. 259.

TEQUI, PIERRE. *Prières de la Vie Interieure.* Paris, 1919.

THAYER, WILLIAM ROSCOE. *Theodore Roosevelt.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company. Pp. 474.

The Mexican War Diary of George B. McClellan. Edited by WILLIAM STAR MYER, Ph.D. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1917. Pp. 97.

THUREAU-DANGIN, PAUL. *The English Catholic Revival in the 19th Century.* New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. Vol. i, pp. 468. Vol. ii, pp. 641.

WALSH, VERY REV. JAMES A. *Observations in the Orient.* Ossining: Catholic Foreign Mission Society, 1919. Pp. 323.

War-Time Agencies of the Churches. Directory and Handbook. Edited by MARGARET RENTON. New York: General War-Time Commission of the Churches (Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America). Pp. 337.

WEBER, REV. NICHOLAS, S. M., S.T.D. *A General History of the Christian Era.* Vol. i. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Education Press. Pp. 343.

WILLARD, JAMES F., Ph.D. *The Union Colony at Greeley, Colorado,* 1869-1871. Boulder, 1918. Pp. 412.

WORK, MONROE N. *Negro Year-Book.* An Annual Encyclopedia of the Negro, 1918-1919. Tuskegee Institute, Ala.: Negro Year-Book Publishing Company, 1919. Pp. 503.

Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1911-12, to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 678.